# Computable Operations on Compact Subsets of Metric Spaces with Applications to Fréchet Distance and Shape Optimization

Chansu Park*, Ji-Won Park†, Sewon Park†, Dongseong Seon* and Martin Ziegler†
*Seoul National University, †KAIST School of Computing (Republic of Korea)

arXiv:1701.08402v2 [cs.LO] 26 Mar 2017

***Abstract*—We extend the Theory of Computation on real numbers, continuous real functions, and bounded closed Euclidean subsets, to compact metric spaces $(X, d)$: thereby generically including computational and optimization problems over higher types, such as the compact 'hyper' spaces of (i) nonempty closed subsets of $X$ w.r.t. Hausdorff metric, and of (ii) equicontinuous functions on $X$. The thus obtained Cartesian closure is shown to exhibit the same structural properties as in the Euclidean case, particularly regarding function pre/image. This allows us to assert the computability of (iii) Fréchet Distances between curves and between loops, as well as of (iv) constrained/Shape Optimization.**

## I. Introduction, Motivation, Background

Identifying (and justifying) the 'right' concepts and notions is crucial for the foundation of a theory. The classical Theory of Computing is based on Turing machines with data encoded in binary and runtime taken in the worst-case over all inputs of length $n \to \infty$ asymptotically — for discrete data. The Theory of Computing with continuous data also dates back to Turing (1937) for single reals and to Grzegorczyk (1957) for real functions; yet the quest for the right notions over higher types is still in progress [Roye97], [Schr09], [KaCo10], [LoNo15] since an input here contains infinite information and cannot even be read in full before having to start producing output. The present work continues the pursuit [KSZ16] for a uniform treatment of computability and complexity on general compact metric spaces $(X, d)$: thus generically including operations on the 'higher type' spaces of (i) nonempty closed subsets of $X$ w.r.t. the Hausdorff distance, and of (ii) equicontinuous functions from $X$ to another compact metric space $Y$ w.r.t. the supremum norm. We are guided by the structural properties exhibited in Computational Logic [KrWe87], [Esca13] and by the well-established Euclidean case [Ko91], [BrWe99], [Weih00]:

### A. Computing Real Numbers, Functions, Closed Subsets

*Computing* a real number $r$ means to produce an integer sequence $a_m$ of numerators of dyadic rationals $a_m/2^m$ approximating $r$ up to absolute error $\leq 2^{-m}$. And *computing* a (possibly partial) function $f :\subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ means:

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{Convert any sequence } (\vec{a}_m) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d \text{ satisfying} \qquad (1)\\ &|\vec{x} - \vec{a}_m/2^m| \leq 2^{-m}, \quad \vec{x} := \lim_m \vec{a}_m/2^m \in \mathrm{dom}(f),\\ &\text{to some } (b_n) \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \text{ s.t. } |y - b_n/2^n| \leq 2^{-n} \text{ for } y = f(\vec{x})\end{aligned}$$

while the behaviour on other sequences $(\vec{a}_m)$ is arbitrary [Weih00, §4.3]. For example addition $\mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is computed by converting $(\vec{a}_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ to $b_n := \lfloor a_{n+2,x}/4 + a_{n+2,y}/4 \rceil$. A computation according to Equation (1) runs *in time* $T(n)$ if $b_n$ appears after at most $T(n)$ steps, regardless of $\vec{x} \in \mathrm{dom}(f)$ or $(\vec{a}_m)$. Following [BrWe99, Definition 4.8] and [Weih00, Exercise 5.2.1], call a non-empty compact $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ *computable* iff there exists a family $A_m \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $W$ has Hausdorff distance $\leq 2^{-m}$ to $\{\vec{a}_m/2^m : \vec{a}_m \in A_m\}$, where $(A_m)$ is required to be *uniformly recursive* in the sense that $\prod_m \{m\} \times \bar{A}_m \subseteq \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}^d$ is decidable. $W$ is *co-computable* if there exists a uniformly co-r.e. such family. We report:

*Fact 1:* Fix non-empty compact $W \subseteq [0;1]^d$ and computable total $\Lambda : W \to \mathbb{R}^e$.

a) $[0;1]^d$ itself is computable. The union of two co-/ computable subsets is again co-/computable, and the intersection of two co-computable sets is co-computable; cmp. [Weih00, Theorem 5.1.13].
b) A point $\vec{x} \in [0;1]^d$ is computable iff the compact singleton $\{\vec{x}\} \subseteq [0;1]^d$ is co-computable iff $\{\vec{x}\}$ is computable; cmp. [Weih00, Example 5.1.12.1].
c) If $W$ is computable, then it contains some computable point; cmp. [Weih00, Exercise 5.1.13].
d) $\Lambda$ admits a runtime bound $T = T(n)$, i.e., depending only on the output precision $n$; and for any such bound $T$, $n \mapsto T(n+1)+1$ is a *binary modulus of continuity* in that $|\vec{x} - \vec{x}'| \leq 2^{-T(n+1)}$ implies $\left|\Lambda(\vec{x}) - \Lambda(\vec{x}')\right| \leq 2^{-n+1}$; cmp. [Ko91, Theorem 2.19] and [Weih00, Theorem 7.2.7].
e) If $W$ is co-computable, then the set $\big\{\big(\vec{a}_0, \ldots, \vec{a}_n\big) :$

$$n \in \mathbb{N},\ \exists \vec{w} \in W\ \forall j \leq n :\ \vec{a}_j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \wedge |\vec{a}_j/2^j - \vec{w}| \leq 2^{-j}\big\}$$

(of finite initial sequences of dyadic sequences converging to some $\vec{w} \in W$) is co-r.e. and $\Lambda$ has a recursive runtime bound; cmp. [Weih00, Theorems 2.4.7+7.2.5+7.2.7].
f) If $W$ and non-empty compact $V \subseteq [0;1]^e$ are co-computable, then so is $\Lambda^{-1}[V] \subseteq W$; cmp. [Weih00, Example 5.1.19.2].
g) If $W$ is computable, then the image $\Lambda[W] \subseteq [0;1]^e$ is again computable compact [Weih00, Example 5.2.11].
h) If compact $W \subseteq [0;1]^d$ coincides with the closure of its interior, $\overline{W^\circ}$, and both $W$ and $[0;1]^d \backslash R^\circ$ are co-computable, then they are computable [Zieg02, Theorem 3.1].

j) If non-empty compact $W \subseteq [0;1]$ is computable, then so are $\max W \in [0;1]$ and $\min W \in [0;1]$; cmp. [Weih00, LEMMA 5.2.6].

Item d) follows from careful continuity and compactness considerations. It corresponds to, and generalizes the (trivial) observation in discrete complexity theory that any total computation on $\{0,1\}^*$ admits a worst-case runtime bound depending only on the length $n$ of, but not on the input $\vec{x} \in \{0,1\}^n$ itself. This complexity-theoretic property in turn is the key to prove Items e) to h) although the latter are only concerned with computability.

Item a) is optimal in that there exist computable compact $V, W \subseteq [0;1]$ such that $V \cap W$ is not computable [Weih00, EXERCISE 5.2.11]; and, regarding Item f), there exists a computable $\Lambda : [0;1] \to [0;1]$ such that $\Lambda^{-1}[0] \neq \emptyset$ contains no computable point [Weih00, EXERCISE 6.3.12]. Also Ernst Specker constructed a recursive and increasing sequence of integer fractions whose supremum is not computable [Weih00, EXAMPLE 1.3.2].

The former condition is known as lower semi-computability [AlBu10, DEFINITION 2] or left-computability; in fact a real number $x$ is computable iff it is both left and right computable [Weih00, LEMMA 4.2.5]. We also record that, with the notation from Equation (1), strict inequality "$f(x) > 0$" is equivalent to "$\exists n : b_n > 1$" and thus r.e. (recursively enumerable, aka semi-decidable), but in general undecidable [Weih00, EXERCISE 4.2.9]. We use *computable* for the continuous realm, *decidable/co-/recursive/enumerable* for the discrete one.

### B. Overview, Previous and Related Work

The present work generalizes the Theory of Computation from Euclidean unit cubes to compact metric spaces $(X,d)$. Being separable, computing here naturally means approximation up to error $2^{-n}$ by a sequence (of indices w.r.t. a fixed partial enumeration $\xi :\subseteq \mathbb{N} \to X$) of some countable dense subset, thus generalizing the dyadic rationals $\mathbb{D} = \{a/2^n : a,n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ canonically employed the real case; cmp. [PERi89, §2] or [Weih00, DEFINITION 8.1.2]. Of course the particular choice of said enumeration $\xi$ heavily affects the computational properties it induces [BrPr03], [Schr04].

We propose in Definition 4 weak conditions on $\xi$ that assert the entire Fact 1 to carry over; see Theorem 7. They permit the categorical construction of dense enumerations, again satisfying said conditions, for (i) the compact space of non-empty closed subsets of $X$ equipped with the Hausdorff distance, and for (ii) the compact space of equicontinuous functions from $X$ to another compact metric space, identified with their graph: Theorem 10. We demonstrate the relevance and applicability of these conditions by asserting (Theorem 14) the computability of the Fréchet Distance between curves and between loops; and by asserting computability of the generic nonlinear optimization problem $\max\{\Lambda(x) : \Phi(x) \leq 0\}$ for every computable cost function $\Lambda : X \to \mathbb{R}$ and every computable, feasible, and open constraint $\Phi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ including the contemporary case of Shape Optimization: Theorem 17.

The so-called *Type-2 Theory of Effectivity* considers computability on second countable topological $\mathrm{T}_0$ spaces [Weih00, LEMMA 3.2.6] by means of partial encodings as infinite binary sequences, that is, over Cantor space. It establishes Cartesian closure by constructing generic encodings of countable products [Weih00, DEFINITION 3.3.3] and of the space of (relatively) continuous functions [Weih00, DEFINITION 3.3.13] as well as, for the case of a complete metric space, of its induced Hausdorff hyperspace [Weih00, EXERCISE 8.1.10]. However, lacking (local/sigma) compactness, properties (d)+(f)+(h) from Fact 1 do not hold in general. Indeed several notions of computability, equivalent in the Euclidean case [BrWe99], have been shown distinct for separable metric spaces [BrPr03]. In fact, compactness is well-known crucial in Pure as well as in Computable Analysis [Schr04], [Esca13], [Stei16].

### C. Recap: Continuous Functions and Compact Metric Spaces

We presume a basic comprehension of mathematical calculus and properties of compact metric spaces $(X,d)$. Write $B(x,r) = \{x' \in X : d(x,x') < r\}$ for the open ball in $X$ with center $x \in X$ and radius $r \geq 0$, $\overline{B}(x,r)$ for its closure (unless $r = 0$). More generally abbreviate $B(S,r) := \bigcup_{x \in S} \overline{B}(x,r)$ and similarly for $\overline{B}(S,r)$, $S \subseteq X$. $S^\circ$ denotes the interior (=largest open subset), $\bar{S}$ the closure (=least closed superset) of $S$; $\partial S := \overline{S} \setminus S^\circ$ is the boundary of $S$. Write $\overline{B}^d := \{\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1^2 + \cdots + x_d^2 \leq 1\}$ for the closed Euclidean $d$-dimensional unit ball, $\mathcal{S}^{d-1} := \partial \overline{B}^d$ for the unit sphere. Let $\mathcal{C}(X,Y)$ denote the space of continuous functions $f : X \to Y$; $\mathcal{C}(X)$ in case $Y = \mathbb{R}$.

*Definition 2:*

a) A *modulus of continuity* of $f : X \to Y$ is a non-decreasing right-continuous mapping $\omega : [0;\infty) \to [0;\infty)$ such that $\omega(t) \to 0$ as $t \to 0$ and $e\big(f(x), f(x')\big) \leq \omega\big(d(x,x')\big)$ holds for all $x, x' \in X$.
b) A *binary modulus of continuity* of $f : X \to Y$ is a non-decreasing mapping $\mu : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N} = \{0,1,\ldots\}$ such that $e\big(f(x), f(x')\big) \leq 2^{-n}$ holds whenever $d(x,x') \leq 2^{-\mu(n)}$.
c) Abbreviate $\mathcal{C}_\mu(X,Y) = \big\{f : X \to Y : f \text{ has binary modulus of continuity } \mu\big\}$; $\mathrm{Lip}_1 := \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{id}}$ is the space of non-expansive functions, $\mathrm{Lip}_2 := \mathcal{C}_{n \mapsto n+1}$.
d) Let $\mathbb{N}^\mathbb{N} = \{(v_0, v_1, \ldots) : v_n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ denote Baire space, equipped with the metric $\beta(\bar{v}, \bar{w}) = 2^{-\min\{n : v_n \neq w_n\}}$.
e) For $\emptyset \subsetneq V, W \subseteq X$ consider the distance function $d_V : X \ni x \mapsto \inf\{d(x,v) : v \in V\} \geq 0$ and Hausdorff distance $d_\mathrm{H}(V,W) = \max\big\{\sup\{d_V(w) : w \in W\}, \sup\{d_W(v) : v \in V\}\big\}$. The sup.metric on $\mathcal{C}(X,Y)$ is denoted $e_\infty(f,g) = \max\big\{e\big(f(x), g(x)\big) : x \in X\big\}$.
f) $\mathcal{E}_X : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ denotes Kolmogorov's metric *entropy*, also known as *modulus of uniform boundedness* [Kohl08, DEF 18.52]: It is defined such that $X$ can be covered by $2^{\mathcal{E}_X(n)}$ open balls of radius $2^{-n}$, but not by $2^{\mathcal{E}_X(n)-1}$.

If the entropy grows linearly, its asymptotic slope coincides with the *Minkowski-Bouligand* or *box-counting dimension* of $X$; otherwise the latter is infinite. Compare also [KSZ16], [Mayo16]... The central mathematical tool of the present work

is compactness, so let us recall some aspects of this concept relevant in the sequel:

*Fact 3:* Suppose $(X,d)$ is a compact metric space; i.e., every sequence in $X$ admits a convergent subsequence; equivalently: every cover $\bigcup_n B(x_n,r_n) \supseteq X$ by open balls contains a finite subcover $\bigcup_{n\leq N} B(x_n,r_n) \supseteq X$. Fix another compact metric space $(Y,e)$.

a) $X$ is complete, that is, every Cauchy sequence converges. A non-empty subset of $X$ is closed iff the restriction of $d$ turns it into a compact space. Every continuous $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ attains its infimum and supremum.

b) Every $f \in \mathcal{C}(X,Y)$ has compact image $:= f[X] \subseteq Y$, is uniformly continuous and thus admits a (binary) modulus of continuity.

c) By the *Arzelà Ascoli Theorem*, a set $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{C}(X,Y)$ has compact closure iff it is a subset of $\mathcal{C}_\mu(X,Y)$ for some binary modulus of continuity $\mu$.

d) By *König's Lemma*, a non-empty subset $C \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ of Baire space has compact closure iff each node has finite degree in the tree of finite initial segments

$$C^* := \big\{\vec{u}=(u_0,\ldots u_n)\,\big|\,n\in\mathbb{N},\,\exists\bar{v}:\,\vec{u}\circ\bar{v}\in C\big\} \;\subseteq\; \mathbb{N}^*$$

e) The set $\mathcal{K}(X)$ of non-empty closed subsets of $X$ equipped with the Hausdorff distance $d_{\mathrm{H}}$ from Definition 2f) constitutes again a compact metric space. We shall call $\big(\mathcal{K}(X),d_{\mathrm{H}}\big)$ *the* Hausdorff hyper-space over $X$.

f) Fix $W \in \mathcal{K}(X)$, $D:\mathbb{N}\to\mathbb{N}$ a sequence, and $\xi :\subseteq \mathbb{N}\to X$ some (possibly partial) enumeration. Then the subsets $x_{\xi,D} = \prod_m x_{\xi,D,m}$ and $W_{\xi,D} := \bigcup_{x\in W} x_{\xi,D}$ of Baire space $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ are compact, where we use the abbreviations $x_{\xi,D,m} := \big\{u\in[2^{D(m)}]\cap\mathrm{dom}(\xi) : d\big(x,\xi(u)\big)\leq 2^{-m}\big\}$ and $[M]:=\{0,1,\ldots,M-1\}$.

g) Consider the compact metric space $(X\times Y, d\times e)$, where $(d\times e)\big((x,y),(x',y')\big) := \max\big\{d(x,x'),e(y,y')\big\}$. A total function $f:X\to Y$ is continuous iff $\mathrm{graph}(f) := \big\{\big(x,f(x)\big) : x\in X\big\}$ is compact, i.e. an element of $\mathcal{K}(X\times Y)$.

h) Moreover it holds $(d\times e)_{\mathrm{H}}\big(\mathrm{graph}(f),\mathrm{graph}(g)\big) \leq$

$$\leq\; e_\infty(f,g) \;\leq\; (\omega{+}\mathrm{id})\Big((d\times e)_{\mathrm{H}}\big(\mathrm{graph}(f),\mathrm{graph}(g)\big)\Big)$$

for $\omega$ any modulus of continuity of $f$ or $g$; and $\mathcal{F}\subseteq\mathcal{C}(X,Y)$ is compact iff $\mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{F}) := \{\mathrm{graph}(f) : f\in\mathcal{F}\}\subseteq\mathcal{K}(X\times Y)$ is.

Item a) justifies the minimum and maximum in Definition 2f).

## II. Computing on a Compact Metric Space

Here we extend Fact 1 from Euclidean $[0;1]^d$ to arbitrary compact metric spaces. Generalizing the real case with dyadic rationals $\mathbb{D}$ as canonical countable dense subset, computation on a metric space is commonly defined by operating on (sequences of indices wrt.) some fixed countable partial dense enumeration; cmp. [PERi89, §2] or [Weih00, Definition 8.1.2]. Of course, the particular choice of said enumeration heavily affects whether, and which items of, Fact 1 carry over [Schr04]. In Definition 4 below we propose conditions that formalize and generalize numerical (i.e. Euclidean) grids to (i) more general compact metric spaces by considering a relaxation of *Hierarchical Space Partitioning* whose (ii) subsets are closed balls that however (iii) may overlap as long as (iv) their centers keep distance $\eta$ from each other:

*Definition 4:* Fix a compact metric space $(X,d)$ of diameter $\mathrm{diam}(X) := \max\{d(x,x') : x,x'\in X\} \leq 1$.

a) For $m\in\mathbb{Z}$, an *$m$-covering of $X$* is a subset $X_m\subseteq X$ such that $X \supseteq \bigcup_{x\in X_m}\overline{B}(x,2^{-m-1})$. For $\eta\in\mathbb{N}$, $X_m\subseteq X$ is *$\eta$-separated* if it holds $d(x,x')\geq 2^{-\eta}$ for all distinct $x,x'\in X_m$; *$\eta$-rectangular* if $\forall x,x'\in X_m : 2^\eta\cdot d(x,x')\in\mathbb{N}$.

b) $(X,d,\xi,D)$ is a *presented (compact) metric space* if $\xi :\subseteq \mathbb{N}\to X$ is a partial dense enumeration and $D:\mathbb{N}\to\mathbb{N}$ strictly increasing such that, for every $m\in\mathbb{N}$, the image $\xi\big[[2^{D(m)}]\big]$ of $[2^{D(m)}]\cap\mathrm{dom}(\xi)$ constitutes an $m$-covering of $X$. For strictly increasing $\eta:\mathbb{N}\to\mathbb{N}$ and injective $\xi$, $(X,d,\xi,D)$ is *$\eta$-rectangular/$\eta$-separated* if, for every $m\in\mathbb{N}$, $\xi\big[[2^{D(m)}]\big]$ constitutes an $\eta(m)$-rectangular/$\eta(m)$-separated $m$-covering of $X$, respectively.

c) Presented metric space $(X,d,\xi,D)$ is *computably compact* if $\mathrm{dom}(\xi)$ and $D:\mathbb{N}\to\mathbb{N}$ are recursive and the following is semi-decidable: $\big\{(a,b,n,u,v)\;\big|\;u,v\in\mathrm{dom}(\xi),$

$$a/2^n < d\big(\xi(u),\xi(v)\big) < b/2^n\big\}\subseteq\mathbb{N}^5$$

d) For presented $(X,d,\xi,D)$, a *name* of a point $x\in X$ is a sequence $\bar{u}=(u_m)$, $u_m\in\mathrm{dom}(\xi)\cap[2^{D(m)}]$, with $d\big(\xi(u_m),x\big)\leq 2^{-m}$. The point $x$ is *computable* if it admits a recursive name. It is *polynomial-time computable* if there exists a Turing machine which prints a name $\bar{u}$ such that $u_m$ appears after a number of steps bounded by some polynomial in $m$.

e) Fix presented $(X,d,\xi,D)$ and $(Y,e,\upsilon,E)$ and recall that $W^*_{\xi,D}\subseteq\mathrm{dom}(\xi)^*$ denotes the set of finite initial sequences of elements $\bar{u}\in W_{\xi,D}$. A *name* of a partial mapping $\Lambda :\subseteq X\to Y$ is a (w.r.t. initial substrings) monotonic, total mapping $\Lambda^* : X^*_{\xi,D}\to Y^*_{\upsilon,E}$ such that, for every $\bar{u}\in x_{\xi,D}$ with $x\in\mathrm{dom}(\Lambda)$, the (w.r.t. initial substrings) non-decreasing sequence $\big(\Lambda^*(u_0,\ldots,u_m)\big)_m$ has unbounded length and supremum $\bar{v}\in\Lambda(x)_{\upsilon,E}$. We write $\Lambda^*_n(\bar{u})$ for the $n$-th element $v_n$ of said supremum. *Computing* $\Lambda$ means (for a Turing machine with write-only right-moving tape) to compute some name $\Lambda^*$. Such a computation runs in time $t(n)$ if it takes at most that many steps to output $\Lambda^*_n(\bar{u})$, independently of $\bar{u}\in\mathrm{dom}(\Lambda)_{\xi,D}$.

f) For presented $(X,d,\xi,D)$, a *name* of compact non-empty $W\subseteq X$ is a sequence $\bar{A}=(A_m)$ of finite sets $A_m\subseteq[2^{D(m)}]\cap\mathrm{dom}(\xi)$ such that, for every $m\in\mathbb{N}$, the set $\xi[A_m]\subseteq X$ has Hausdorff distance (Definition 2f) at most $2^{-m}$ to $W$. The empty sequence is a name of $\emptyset$. $W$ is *computable* if it has a name $\bar{A}=(A_m)$ which is uniformly recursive in the sense that the set $\prod_m\{m\}\times A_m\subseteq\mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{N}$ is decidable. If said set is co-r.e., $W$ is called *co-computable*. A *standard* name $\bar{A}$ of $W$ satisfies $d_W\big(\xi(a)\big)<2^{-m}$ for every $a\in A_m\subseteq[2^{D(m)}]\cap\mathrm{dom}(\xi)$, and $d_W\big(\xi(a)\big)>2^{-m-1}$ for every $a\in[2^{D(m)}]\cap\mathrm{dom}(\xi)\setminus A_m$.

g) A *rounding function* for presented $(X, d, \xi, D)$ is a mapping $R : \mathrm{dom}(\xi) \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathrm{dom}(\xi)$ such that it holds $R(u, m) \in [2^{D(m)}]$ and $d\Big(\xi\big(R(u, m)\big), \xi(u)\Big) \leq 2^{-m-1}$.

[Weih03, DEFINITION 6.2.2] calls an $m$-covering $(m+1)$-*spanning*. Various common notions of computability for closed subsets, equivalent over $\mathbb{R}^d$ [BrPr03, THEOREM 3.6], are known to become distinct over more general spaces [BrPr03, THEOREMS 3.9(3)+3.11(4)+3.15(2)]. Definition 4 thus has been crafted with great care. For instance, although computations according to e) operate on approximations up to absolute error $\leq 2^{-m}$, the requirement in a) of an $m$-covering to provide strictly better approximations is crucial. Item c) strengthens [Weih00, DEFINITION 8.1.2.3] in requiring $\mathrm{dom}(\xi)$ to be recursive, thus asserting a computably compact space $X$ to be a computable subset of itself in the sense of Item f); see Theorem 7a) below. It also guarantees the set $X^*_{\xi,D} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ to be co-r.e.; see Theorem 7e). The rest of this subsection will provide further justification by comparison to the Euclidean Fact 1. Indeed, Definition 4 generalizes the real case:

*Example 5:*

a) Let $\mathbb{D}_m := \{a/2^m : a \in \mathbb{N}, 0 \leq a < 2^m\}$ and $\mathbb{D} := \bigcup_m \mathbb{D}_m$ denote the set of dyadic rationals in $[0; 1)$. Define $D(m) := m + 1$ as well as $\varrho(0) := 0$ and inductively $\varrho : [2^{m+1}] \setminus [2^m] \ni a + 2^m \mapsto (2a+1)/2^{m+1} \in \mathbb{D}_{m+1} \setminus \mathbb{D}_m$. Then $\big([0; 1],\ |\cdot|,\ \varrho, \mathrm{id}+1\big)$ constitutes a computably $m$-rectangular (formally: id-rectangular) compact space. It admits a computable rounding function, namely

$$R(\cdot, m) \ : \ [2^{m+n+1}] \setminus [2^{m+n}] \ \ni \ a + 2^{m+n} \ \mapsto \\ \mapsto \ 2^m + \lfloor (2a+1)/(2^{n+1}) - \tfrac{1}{2} \rceil \ \in \ [2^{m+1}] \ .$$

b) The 'circle' $[0; 1) \mod 1$ with the metric $d(x, y) = \min\{|x - y|, |x - y - 1|\}$, equipped with the enumeration $\varrho$ from (a) but now taking $D(m) = m$, is also computably id-rectangular compact.

c) Consider Cantor space $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ equipped with the metric $\beta$ inherited from Baire space; recall Definition 4d). We turn this into a computably $m$-rectangular compact space $\big(\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}, \beta, \gamma, \mathrm{id}+1\big)$ as follows: Let $\tilde{\gamma} : \mathbb{N} \to \{0, 1\}^*$ enumerate all finite binary strings in order of length, define $\gamma(0) := 0^\omega$, $\gamma(u + 1) := \tilde{\gamma}(u) \circ 1 \circ 0^\omega$; and truncation constitutes a computable rounding function.

d) Suppose $\psi : X \to Y$ is a homeomorphism between computably compact $(X, d, \xi, D)$ and topological space $Y$. Then $\big(Y, d \circ \psi^{-1}, \psi \circ \xi, D\big)$ constitutes a computable compact metric space (thus justifying the notation in b). If the former is $\eta(m)$-separated/rectangular/has rounding function $R$, then so does the latter.

e) For computably compact metric spaces $(X, d, \xi, D)$ and $(Y, e, \upsilon, E)$, their Cartesian product $(X \times Y, d \times e, \xi \times \upsilon, D \cdot E)$ becomes again a computably compact metric space by defining $\xi \times \upsilon :\subseteq \mathbb{N} \to X \times Y$ inductively on $\big[D(m) \cdot E(m); D(m+1) \cdot E(m+1) - 1\big] \cap \mathbb{N}$:

$$D(m) \cdot E(m) + \big(D(m+1) - D(m)\big) \cdot v + u \ \mapsto \\ \mapsto \ \Big(\xi\big(D(m) + u\big), \upsilon\big(E(m) + v\big)\Big), \\ \mathbb{N} \ni u < D(m+1) - D(m), \quad \mathbb{N} \ni v < E(m)$$

$$D(m+1) \cdot E(m) + D(m+1) \cdot v + u \ \mapsto \\ \mapsto \ \Big(\xi(u), \upsilon\big(E(m) + v\big)\Big), \\ \mathbb{N} \ni u < D(m+1), \quad \mathbb{N} \ni v < E(m+1) - E(m)$$

If $X$ and $Y$ are $\eta(m)$-separated/rectangular, then so is $X \times Y$. Recursive rounding functions for $X$ and $Y$ give rise to one for $X \times Y$.

Items a+e) generalize the case of real vectors. A computable compact subset need not in turn constitute a computably compact metric space: consider for example $\{1/\pi\} \subseteq [0; 1]$.

*Remark 6:*

a) To every compact $(X, d)$ with partial dense enumeration $\xi :\subseteq \mathbb{N} \to X$, there exists some $D : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ rendering $(X, d, \xi, D)$ a presented metric space. If the restricted distance

$$\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \supseteq \mathrm{dom}(\xi) \times \mathrm{dom}(\xi) \ni (u, v) \mapsto d\big(\xi(u), \xi(v)\big) \in \mathbb{R}$$

is computable and the natively $\Pi_2$ set

$$\Big\{\big(u, n, v_1, n_1, \ldots v_j, n_j\big) \ \Big| \ j \in \mathbb{N},\ u, v_1, \ldots v_j \in \mathrm{dom}(\xi), \\ \overline{B}\big(\xi(u), 2^{-n}\big) \subseteq B\big(\xi(v_1), 2^{-n_1}\big) \cup \cdots B\big(\xi(v_j), 2^{-n_j}\big)\Big\} \\ = \Big\{\big(u, n, v_1, \ldots n_j\big) \ \Big| \ \forall w \in \mathrm{dom}(\xi) : d\big(\xi(w), \xi(u)\big) > 2^{-n} \\ \vee \ \exists i \leq j : \ d\big(\xi(w), \xi(v_i)\big) < 2^{-n_i} \ \Big\} \qquad (2)$$

is actually semi-decidable, then there exists a recursive such $D$. [BrPr03, DEFINITION 2.6] calls Equation (2), with dyadic radii generalized to arbitrary rationals, the *effective covering property*.

b) Every compact metric space $(X, d)$ admits a partial dense enumeration $\xi$ such that $D(m) := \mathcal{E}_X(m+1)$ turns $(X, d, \xi, D)$ into an $(m+1)$-separated space: Let $\xi[2^{D(m)}]$ enumerate the centers of open balls of radius $2^{-m-1}$ covering $X$.

Conversely whenever $(X, d, \xi, D)$ is $\eta$-separated, it holds $D(m) \leq \mathcal{E}_X\big(\eta(m) + 1\big)$: Consider some choice of $2^{\mathcal{E}_X(\eta(m)+1)}$ centers of open balls of radius $2^{-\eta(m)-1}$ covering $X$; then each one can contain at most one of the points in $\xi[2^{D(m)}]$, since the latter have pairwise distance $\geq 2^{-\eta(m)}$; cmp. [KSZ16, §3].

c) Not every convex compact metric space admits a rectangular enumeration, though: Consider the geodesic distance on a circle of irrational circumference. Even in the Euclidean case, it has been conjectured since Erdös and Ulam (1946) that no open subset of $\mathbb{R}^2$ admits a dense sequence of pairwise rational distances; cmp. `http://terrytao.wordpress.com/2014/12/20`

d) Suppose $(X, d, \xi, D)$ is computably compact. Then computably compact $\big(X, d, \xi, m \mapsto D(m+1)\big)$ admits a recursive rounding function: Given $u \in \mathrm{dom}(\xi)$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists, and Definition 4c) asserts enumeration of $[2^{D(m+1)}] \cap \mathrm{dom}(\xi)$ to find, some $v =: R(u, m)$ with

$d\big(\xi(v),\xi(u)\big) < 2^{-m-1}$. (In $[2^{D(m)}] \cap \mathrm{dom}(\xi)$, distance $2^{-m-1}$ is feasible, but not necessarily computably so…)

e) $(A_m)$ is a name of non-empty compact $W \subseteq X$ iff (i) every $\bar{a} = (a_m)$ with $a_m \in A_m$ satisfying

$$\forall n, m : d\big(\xi(a_m), \xi(a_n)\big) \leq 2^{-m} + 2^{-n} \qquad (3)$$

constitutes a name of some $x \in W$ and if (ii) conversely to every $x \in W$ there exists a name $\bar{a}$ such that Equation (3) holds: If $(A_m)$ constitutes a name of $W$, then (i) every $\bar{a}$ satisfying Equation (3) gives rise to $x : \lim_m \xi(a_m) \in X$ by completeness, and $d_W\big(\xi(a_m)\big) \leq 2^{-m}$ shows $x \in W$; and (ii) to $x \in W$ and every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists some $a_m \in A_m$ with $d\big(\xi(a_m), x\big) \leq 2^{-m}$, hence satisfying Equation (3).

f) Every standard name of some non-empty compact $W \subseteq X$ is also a name of $W$: By Definition 4b) there exists, to every $x \in W$, some $a \in \mathrm{dom}(\xi) \cap [2^{D(m)}]$ with $d\big(\xi(a), x\big) \leq 2^{-m-1}$; and $(A_m)$ being a standard name of $W$ requires $a \in A_m$ whenever $d_W\big(\xi(a)\big) \leq 2^{-m-1}$: thus $(A_m)$ is a name of $W$.
Conversely, to every co-r.e/recursive name $(A_m)$ of non-empty compact $W \subseteq X$, there exists a co-r.e./recursive *standard* name of $W$: Indeed every $A'_m$ with

$$\Big\{a' \in \mathrm{dom}(\xi) \cap [2^{D(m)}] \;\Big|\; \exists a \in \mathrm{dom}(\xi) \cap [2^{D(m+3)}] : a \in A_{m+3} \wedge d\big(\xi(a), \xi(a')\big) \leq \mathbf{5} \cdot 2^{-m-3}\Big\} \subseteq$$
$$\subseteq A'_m \subseteq \Big\{a' \in \mathrm{dom}(\xi) \cap [2^{D(m)}] \;\Big|\; \exists a \in A_{m+3} \wedge \wedge\, d\big(\xi(a), \xi(a')\big) < \mathbf{7} \cdot 2^{-m-3}\Big\} \qquad (4)$$

constitutes such a standard name: To $a \in A_{m+3}$ there exists some $x \in W$ with $d\big(\xi(a), x\big) \leq 2^{-m-3}$, hence $a' \in A'_m$ implies $d\big(\xi(a), \xi(a')\big) < 7 \cdot 2^{-m-3}$ and in turn $d_W\big(\xi(a')\big) < (7+1) \cdot 2^{-m-3} = 2^{-m}$; while $a' \in \mathrm{dom}(xi) \cap [2^{D(m)}] \setminus A'_m$ implies $d\big(\xi(a), \xi(a')\big) > 5 \cdot 2^{-m-3}$ for every $a \in A_{m+3}$, and in turn $d_W\big(\xi(a')\big) > (5-1) \cdot 2^{-m-3} = 2^{-m-1}$. Now recall that strict inequality of distances is r.e., and non-strict is co-r.e. Hence, if $(A_m)$ is uniformly co-r.e., then so is the left-hand side of Equation (4); and if $(A_m)$ is even uniformly recursive, then the right-hand side is uniformly r.e.: now apply the next item to its complement.

g) Fix pairwise disjoint families $X_m$ and $Z_m$ of uniformly co-r.e. subsets of integers. Then there exists a uniformly recursive family $Y_m$ disjoint to $Z_m$ with $X_m \subseteq Y_m$:
For given $x, m$ search in parallel for a witness that $x \notin X_m$ and for one that $x \notin Z_m$ and report the (negation of the) first to succeed.

h) Suppose $(X, d, \xi, D)$ and $(Y, e, \upsilon, E)$ are computably compact with rounding function $R : \mathrm{dom}(\xi) \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathrm{dom}(\xi)$. Let $(A_m)_m$ denote a name of non-empty compact $W \subseteq X$, and $\Lambda^*$ a name of $\Lambda : W \subseteq X \to Y$, computable in time $t(n)$. Recall that $W^*_{\xi,D} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ denotes the set of all finite initial segments of sequences in $W_{\xi,D}$ and observe that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a \in A_{t(n)}$, even though $\xi(a)$ itself might not even lie in $W$, the closed ball $\overline{B}\big(\xi(a), 2^{-t(n)}\big)$ does intersect $W$. Moreover, for every $x \in W \cap \overline{B}\big(\xi(a), 2^{-t(n)}\big)$, the finite sequence $\vec{a} := \big(R(a,0), R(a,1), \ldots, R(a,t(n)-1), a\big)$ extends to some name $\bar{a}$ of $x$, i.e., belongs to $W^*_{\xi,D}$. Abbreviating $y := \Lambda(x)$, the machine computing $\Lambda^*$ will on input $\bar{a}$ produce $\Lambda^*_n(\bar{a}) =: b_n \in [\mathrm{dom}(\upsilon) \cap [2^{E(n)}]$ with $e\big(\upsilon(b_n), y\big) \leq 2^{-n}$ for $y := \Lambda(x)$. However, in time bound $t(n)$ it cannot even read past $\vec{a}$; hence $\Lambda^*_n(\bar{a})$ depends only on $\vec{a}$: $\Lambda^*_n(\bar{a}) = \Lambda^*_n(\bar{u})$ holds whenever $\beta(\bar{a}, \bar{u}) \leq 2^{-t(n)}$. Let us denote by $\Lambda^t_n(a)$ the thus well-defined composite mapping $A_{t(n)} \ni a \mapsto \vec{a} \mapsto \bar{a} \mapsto \Lambda^*_n(\bar{a}) \in [\mathrm{dom}(\upsilon) \cap [2^{E(n)}]$ satisfying $e\Big(\upsilon\big(\Lambda^t_n(a)\big), y\Big) \leq 2^{-n}$ for all $y \in \Lambda\big[W \cap \overline{B}\big(\xi(a), 2^{-t(n)}\big)\big]$. ■

Item g) can be regarded as a discrete counterpart to Fact 1j). Item h) is based on the continuity/adversary argument underlying the sometimes so-called *Main Theorem* [Weih00, §2.2], Fact 1d+e), and Theorem 7d+e) below.

### A. Computable Operations on a Compact Metric Space

For presented metric spaces, the composition of two computable functions is again computable; computable functions map computable points to computable points; a constant function is computable iff its value is computable. Moreover, similarly to Fact 1 and [Weih03, DEF 4.1], we have:

*Theorem 7:* Let $(X, d, \xi, D)$ and $(Y, e, \upsilon, E)$ be computably compact spaces with recursive rounding functions $R$ and $S$ according to Definition 4g). Suppose compact non-empty $W \subseteq X$ and total $\Lambda : W \to Y$ are computable.

a) $X$ is a computable subset of itself. The union of two co-/computable sets is again co-/computable; the intersection of two co-computable sets is co-computable.

b) A point $x \in X$ is computable iff the compact singleton $\{x\} \subseteq X$ is co-computable iff $\{x\} \subseteq X$ is computable.

c) If $W$ is computable, it contains some computable point.

d) $\Lambda$ admits a computable time bound $T = T(n)$ depending only on the output precision $n$; for any such bound $T$, $n \mapsto T(n+1)+1$ is a binary modulus of continuity of $\Lambda$.

e) If $W$ is co-computable, then $W^*_{\xi,D}$ is co-r.e.; and $\Lambda$ has a recursive binary modulus of continuity and runtime bound.

f) If $W$ and non-empty compact $V \subseteq Y$ are co-computable, then so is $\Lambda^{-1}[V] \subseteq W$.

g) If non-empty compact $W$ is computable, then the image $\Lambda[W] \subseteq Y$ is again (compact and) computable.

h) If non-empty compact $W \subseteq X$ coincides with $\overline{R^\circ}$ and both $W$ and $X \setminus R^\circ$ are co-computable, then they are computable.

j) A total $\Lambda : W \to Y$ is computable (in the sense of Def.4e) iff the compact set $\mathrm{graph}(\Lambda) \subseteq X \times Y$ is computable.

Item g) asserts, together with Fact 1j), that $\max \Lambda[W]$ and $\min \Lambda[W]$ are computable reals for every computable non-empty compact $W \subseteq X$ and $\Lambda : W \to [0;1]$. And Items b+f) imply that, under the same hypothesis and for computable $y \in Y$, a *unique* solution $x \in W$ to the equation "$\Lambda(x) = y$" is computable. Item j) effectivizes Fact 3g), that

is the identification of a function as a transformation with its graph as a 'static' object, and justifies our encoding of compact function spaces in Subsection II-C below; cmp [Bra05, §4].

### *B. Proof of Theorem 7*

a) By Definition 4b), $A_m := \mathrm{dom}(\xi) \cap [2^{D(m)}]$ is a name of $X$; and uniformly recursive according to Definition 4c). For $A_m, B_m \subseteq [2^{D(m)}] \cap \mathrm{dom}(\xi)$ with $d_{\mathrm{H}}\big(\xi[A_m], W\big), d_{\mathrm{H}}\big(\xi[B_m], V\big) \leq 2^{-m}$, $A_m \cup B_m \subseteq [2^{D(m)}] \cap \mathrm{dom}(\xi)$ has $d_{\mathrm{H}}\big(\xi[A_m \cup B_m], W \cup V\big) \leq 2^{-m}$; and is uniformly recursive/co-r.e. whenever both $(A_m)$ and $(B_m)$ are. The cases $W = \emptyset$ or $V = \emptyset$ are easily treated separately. Finally, for uniformly co-r.e. $A_n, B_{n'}$ subsets of recursive $\mathrm{dom}(\xi) \cap [2^{D(m)}]$,

$$C_m := \big\{ c \in A_m \;\big|\; \forall n, n' \in \mathbb{N}\ \exists a \in A_n\ \exists b \in B_{n'} : \\ d\big(\xi(a), \xi(b)\big) \leq 2^{-n} + 2^{-n'} \wedge d\big(\xi(c), \xi(a)\big) \leq 2^{-n} + 2^{-m} \big\}$$

is co-r.e. (since $\mathrm{dom}(\xi)$ is) and a name of $V \cap W$: To every $x \in V \cap W$ there exist $a_n \in A_n$ and $b_{n'} \in B_{n'}$ with $d\big(\xi(a_n), x\big) \leq 2^{-n}$ and $d\big(\xi(b_{n'}), x\big) \leq 2^{-n'}$, so $d\big(\xi(a_n), \xi(b_{n'})\big) \leq 2^{-n} + 2^{-n'}$; and, since $x \in V$, there exists some $c \in A_m$ with $d\big(\xi(c), x\big) \leq 2^{-m}$, so $d\big(\xi(c), \xi(a)\big) \leq 2^{-n} + 2^{-m}$: resulting in $c \in C_m$. Conversely, to every $c \in C_m$, there are sequences $a_n \in A_n$ and $b_{n'} \in B_{n'}$, and thus $v_n \in V$ and $w_{n'} \in W$ with $d\big(\xi(a_n), v_n\big), d\big(\xi(b_{n'}), w_{n'}\big) \leq 2^{-n'}$; by compactness $\xi(a_{n_k}) \to \lim_k v_{n_k} =: v \in V$ and $\xi(b_{n'_k}) \to \lim_k w_{n'_k} =: w \in W$ for some subsequences; now $d\big(\xi(a_{n_k}), \xi(b_{n'_k})\big) \leq 2^{-n_k} + 2^{-n'_k}$ implies $v = w =: x \in V \cap W$; finally $d\big(\xi(c), x\big) \leftarrow d\big(\xi(c), \xi(a_{n_k})\big) \leq 2^{-n_k} + 2^{-m} \to 2^{-m}$ as $k \to \infty$.

b) For computable $x$ with recursive name $\bar{u} = (u_m)_m \in x_{\xi,D}$, the uniformly recursive sequence of singletons $A_m := \{u_m\}$ constitutes a name of $\{x\}$. Conversely suppose $(A_m)$ is a co-r.e. name of $\{x\}$. Then the sets

$$A'_m := \big\{ R(a', m) \;\big|\; a' \in \mathrm{dom}(\xi) \cap [2^{D(m+3)}], \\ \forall a \in [2^{D(m+3)}] :\ a \notin A_{m+3} \vee d\big(\xi(a), \xi(a')\big) < 2^{-m-2} \big\}$$

are (i) uniformly semi-decidable, (ii) non-empty, and (iii) any sequence $a'_m \in A'_m$ constitutes a name of $x$. Indeed (ii) to $x \in X$ there exists $a' \in \mathrm{dom}(\xi) \cap [2^{D(m+3)}]$ with $d\big(\xi(a'), x\big) \leq 2^{-m-4}$, while every $a \in A_{m+3}$ satisfies $d\big(\xi(a), x\big) \leq 2^{-m-3}$. Conversely (iii) every $a \in A_{m+3}$ satisfies $d\big(\xi(a), x\big) \leq 2^{-m-3}$; hence any $R(a', m) \in A'_m$ has $d\big(\xi(a'), x\big) < 3 \cdot 2^{-m-3}$ and $d\big(\xi(R(a', m)), x\big) < 7^{-m-3}$.

c) Let $A_m \subseteq [2^{D(m)}] \cap \mathrm{dom}(\xi)$ be a uniformly recursive name of compact non-empty $W \subseteq X$. Then, starting with any $a_0 \in A_2$, one can iteratively computationally search for, and according to Remark 6e) is guaranteed to find, some $a_m \in A_{m+2}$ with $d\big(\xi(a_m), \xi(a_n)\big) < 2^{-m-1} + 2^{-n-1}$ for all $n < m$: recall that strict inequality of distances is semi-decidable according to Definition 4b). Then $u_m := R(a_m, m) \in \mathrm{dom}(\xi) \cap [2^{D(m)}]$ satisfies $d\big(\xi(u_m), \xi(u_n)\big) < 2^{-m} + 2^{-n}$ and $d_W\big(\xi(u_m)\big) \leq 3 \cdot 2^{-m-2} < 2^{-m}$ by triangle inequality; hence $x := \lim_m \xi(u_m) \in W$.

d) Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and recall from Remark 6h) that a machine $\mathcal{A}$ computing a name $\Lambda^*$ of $\Lambda$, when presented with any sequence $\bar{u} = (u_m)_m \in w_{\xi,\Xi}$ for some $w \in W$, produces according to Definition 4c) some $v_n = \Lambda_n \in \mathrm{dom}(v)$ with $e\big(\Lambda(x), v(v_n)\big) \leq 2^{-n}$: after a finite number $T = T_{\mathcal{A}}(n, \bar{u})$ of steps and in particular 'knowing' no more than the first $T$ entries of $\bar{u}$. The thus defined function $T(n, \cdot) : W_{\xi,\ell} \to \mathbb{N}$ (implicitly depending on $\mathcal{A}$) is therefore locally constant, that is, continuous: $T(n, \bar{u}) = T(n, \bar{u}')$ whenever $\beta(\bar{u}, \bar{u}') \leq 2^{-T(n,\bar{u})}$.
Now Fact 3f) asserts $W_{\xi,\Xi} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ to be compact; hence, by Fact 3a), $T(n, \cdot)$ is bounded by some least integer $T(n)$ (again depending also on $\mathcal{A}$). We show that $n \mapsto T(n+1) + 1$ constitutes a binary modulus of continuity of $\Lambda\big|_W$: Fix $x \in W$ and consider for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ some $u_m \in [\Xi(m)]$ with $d\big(x, \xi(u_m)\big) \leq 2^{-m-1}$ according to Definition 4a). For this particular $\bar{u} \in x_{\xi,\Xi}$, every $x' \in \overline{B}(x, 2^{-m-1})$ has $d\big(x', \xi(u_m)\big) \leq 2^{-m}$ for all $m' \leq m$; indeed $x'$ admits a sequence $\bar{u}' \in x'_{\xi,\Xi}$ which coincides with $\bar{u}$ on the first $m$ entries. And for $m \geq T(n) \geq T(n, \bar{u})$ by definition, $\mathcal{A}$'s output $\bar{v}$ on input $\bar{u}$ coincides up to position $n$ with its output $\bar{v}'$ on input $\bar{u}'$. Triangle inequality thus yields

$$d(x, x') \leq 2^{-T(n)-1} \quad \Rightarrow \quad e\big(\Lambda(x), \Lambda(x')\big) \leq 2^{-n+1} \ .$$

e) Let $(A_m)_m$ denote a co-r.e. name for $W$. According to Remark 6e), $W^*_{\xi,\ell}$ coincides with the set

$$\Big\{ \vec{u} = (u_0, \ldots, u_n) \;\Big|\; n \in \mathbb{N},\ \forall i, j \leq n : \\ u_j \in \mathrm{dom}(\xi) \cap [2^{\ell(j)}] \ \wedge\ d\big(\xi(u_i), \xi(u_j)\big) \leq 2^{-i} + 2^{-j} \wedge \\ \forall m\ \exists a_m \in A_m :\ d\big(\xi(a_m), \xi(u_j)\big) \leq 2^{-m} + 2^{-j} \Big\} \quad (5)$$

which is clearly co-r.e. with "$\forall m$" as only unbounded quantifier and co-r.e. inequality "$d\big(\xi(u_i), \xi(u_j)\big) \leq 2^{-i} + 2^{-j}$". Indeed, for every $\vec{u} = (u_0, \ldots, u_n)$ according to Equation (5) and fixed $j \leq n$, there exists a sequence $a_m \in A_m$ such that, one the one hand, $d_W\big(\xi(a_m)\big) \leq 2^{-m} \to 0$ hence $\lim_n \xi(a_{m_n}) =: x \in W$ for some subsequence; while on the other hand $2^{-j} \leftarrow 2^{-m_n+1} + 2^{-j} \geq d\big(\xi(a_{m_n}), \xi(u_j)\big) \to d\big(x, \xi(u_j)\big)$. This asserts $\vec{u}$ to extend to some $\bar{u} \in x_{\xi,\ell}$.
To find a recursive time bound $T' \geq T$ to (d), extend the partial algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ computing $\Lambda^*$ from compact $W_{\xi,\Xi}$ to $\mathcal{A}'_n$ accepting inputs $\bar{u}$ from the entire set $\prod_{m \geq 0} [2^{\ell(m)}]$ by, simultaneously to executing $\mathcal{A}(\bar{u})$ until it prints the $n$-th output symbol, trying to refute $\bar{u} \in W_{\xi,\Xi}$ just established as co-r.e. Noting that $\mathcal{A}'_n$ indeed terminates on all possible inputs from compact $\prod_{m \geq 0} [2^{\ell(m)}] \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and therefore (d) in some time bound $T'(n) \geq T(n)$ depending only on $n$, the following algorithm computes such $T'(n)$:

Initialize $T' := 1$. Simulate $\mathcal{A}'_n$ on each $\vec{u} \in \prod_{m=0}^{T'-1} [2^{\ell(m)}] \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{T'}$ until either (i) it terminates or

(ii) reads past the finite input. In case (ii), increase $T'$ and restart; else output $T'$ and terminate.

f) First observe that, since $\Lambda$ is continuous according to (d), $\Lambda^{-1}$ maps compact/closed $V \subseteq Y$ to a closed/compact subset of $W$ and/or $X$. Now let $(A_m)_m$ denote a co-r.e. name of $W$, $(B_k)_k$ similarly one of $V$, and $\mu : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ simultaneously a recursive both binary modulus of continuity of $\Lambda$ and runtime bound according to (e). Now consider the uniformly recursive mapping $\Lambda^\mu_n : A_{\mu(n)} \to \mathrm{dom}(\upsilon) \cap [2^{E(n)}]$ according to Remark 5h), and let

$$\begin{aligned} C_m \;:=\; \big\{ a \in \mathrm{dom}(\xi) \cap [2^{D(m)}] \;\big|\; \forall n, n' \; \exists a' \in A_{\mu(n')} \\ \exists b \in B_n : \; e\big(\upsilon\big(\Lambda^\mu_{n'}(a')\big), \upsilon(b)\big) \le 2^{-n} + 2^{-n'} \wedge \\ \wedge \; d\big(\xi(a), \xi(a')\big) \le 2^{-m} + 2^{-\mu(n')} \big\} \;. \end{aligned}$$

It is clearly uniformly co-r.e., since $(A_{\mu(n')})$ and $(B_n)$ are, and non-strict inequality is as well, and both $\mathrm{dom}(\xi) \cap [2^{D(\mu(n'))}]$ and $\mathrm{dom}(\upsilon) \cap [2^{E(n)}]$ are recursive by hypothesis. We show that $(C_m)$ constitutes a standard name of $\Lambda^{-1}[V]$: Every $a \in \mathrm{dom}(\xi) \cap [2^{D(m)}]$ with $d_{\Lambda^{-1}[V]}\big(\xi(a)\big) \le 2^{-m-1}$ belongs to $C_m$: To $x \in \Lambda^{-1}[V]$ with $d\big(x, \xi(a)\big)] \le 2^{-m-1}$ and every $n, n' \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $a' \in A_{\mu(n')}$ with $d\big(x, \xi(a')\big) \le 2^{-\mu(n')}$ as well as $b \in B_n$ with $e\big(y, \upsilon(b)\big) \le 2^{-n}$ for $y := \Lambda(x) \in V$; hence $d\big(\xi(a), \xi(a')\big) \le 2^{-m-1} + 2^{-\mu(n')}$, and $e\big(\upsilon\big(\Lambda^\mu_{n'}(a')\big), y\big) \le 2^{-n'}$ implies $e\big(\upsilon\big(\Lambda^\mu_{n'}(a')\big), \upsilon(b)\big) \le 2^{-n'} + 2^{-n}$.
Conversely to $a \in C_m$ there exist sequences $a'_{n'} \in A_{\mu(n')}$ and $b_n \in B_n$ with $d\big(\xi(a), \xi(a'_{n'})\big) \le 2^{-m} + 2^{-\mu(n')}$ and $e\big(\upsilon\big(\Lambda^\mu_{n'}(a'_{n'})\big), \upsilon(b_n)\big) \le 2^{-n} + 2^{-n'}$. By compactness, $\lim_k \xi(a'_{n'_k}) = x \in W$ and $\lim_k \upsilon(b_{n_k}) = y \in V$ for some subsequences. It follows $d\big(\xi(a), x\big) \le 2^{-m}$ as well as $e\big(\Lambda(x), y\big) \leftarrow e\big(\upsilon\big(\Lambda^\mu_{n'_k}(a'_{n'_k})\big), \upsilon(b_{n_k})\big) \le 2^{-n_k} + 2^{-n'_k} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Therefore $x \in \Lambda^{-1}[y]$ and $d\big(\xi(a), x\big) \leftarrow d\big(\xi(a), \xi(a'_{n'_k})\big) \le 2^{-m} + 2^{-\mu(n')} \to 2^{-m}$ as $k \to \infty$.

g) The image $\Lambda[W] \subseteq Y$ is compact by Fact 3b). To see its computability, fix a recursive name $(A_m)_m$ of $W$, a recursive binary modulus of continuity $\mu : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ of $\Lambda$ according to (e), and uniformly recursive $\Lambda^\mu_n : A_{\mu(n)} \to \mathrm{dom}(\upsilon) \cap [2^{E(n)}]$ according to Remark 6h). Now consider the set

$$B_m \;:=\; \big\{ \Lambda^\mu_m(a) \;\big|\; a \in A_{\mu(m)} \big\}$$

which is clearly uniformly decidable since $\mu$ and $A_{\mu(m)}$ is. We show that $(B_m)$ constitutes a name of $\Lambda[W]$: To every $y = \Lambda(x)$ with $x \in W$ there exists by hypothesis some $a \in A_{\mu(m)}$ with $d\big(\xi(a), x\big) \le 2^{-\mu(m)}$; hence $e\Big(\upsilon\big(\Lambda^\mu_m(a)\big), y\Big) \le 2^{-m}$ by choice of $\mu$ and $\Lambda^\mu_m$. Conversely, every $\Lambda^\mu_m(a) \in B_m$ arises from some $a \in A_{\mu(m)}$ and in turn some $x \in W$ with $d\big(\xi(a), x\big) \le 2^{-\mu(n)}$; hence $e\Big(\upsilon\big(\Lambda^\mu_m(a)\big), y\Big) \le 2^{-m}$ for $y := \Lambda(x) \in \Lambda[W]$.

h) By Remark 6f) suppose w.l.o.g. that $(A_m)$ is a co-r.e. *standard* name of $W$ and $(B_n)$ one of $X \setminus R^\circ$. We show that every family $(C_m)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} A_m \;\subseteq\; C_m \;\subseteq\; \big\{ u \in \mathrm{dom}(\xi) \cap [2^{D(m)}] \;\big|\; \exists n > m \\ \exists v \in \mathrm{dom}(\xi) \cap [2^{D(n)}] \setminus B_n : d\big(\xi(u), \xi(v)\big) < 2^{-m} \big\} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

constitutes a name of $W$: Since the right-hand side of Equation (6) is r.e., the claim then follows with Remark 6g). Indeed, every element $u$ of the right-hand side arises from some $v \notin B_n$ with $d\big(\xi(u), x\big) < 2^{-m}$ for $x := \xi(v)$. $(B_n)$ being a standard name of $X \setminus X^\circ$ implies $d_{X \setminus W^\circ}(x) > 2^{-n}$ and in particular $x \in W^\circ \subseteq W$.
On the other hand for every $u \in A_m$, being a standard name implies $d\big(\xi(u), x\big) < 2^{-m}$ for some $x \in W = \overline{W^\circ}$. Hence there exists some $y \in W^\circ$ with $d(x, y) < \varepsilon := 2^{-m} - d\big(x, \xi(u)\big)$; and in turn some integer $n > m$ such that $2^{-n-1} < \varepsilon - d(x, y)$ and $B(y, 3 \cdot 2^{-n-1}) \subseteq W^\circ$ holds; and in turn some $v \in \mathrm{dom}(\xi) \cap [2^{D(n)}]$ with $d\big(y, \xi(v)\big) \le 2^{-n-1}$. Then $d\big(\xi(v), \xi(u)\big) \;\le$

$$\le \underbrace{d\big(\xi(v), y\big)}_{\le 2^{-n-1}} + \underbrace{d\big(y, x\big)}_{< \varepsilon - 2^{-n-1}} + \underbrace{d\big(x, \xi(u)\big)}_{= 2^{-m} - \varepsilon} < 2^{-m}$$

and $B\big(\xi(v), 2 \cdot 2^{-n-1}\big) \subseteq B(y, 3 \cdot 2^{-n-1}) \subseteq W^\circ$ implies $d_{X \setminus W^\circ}\big(\xi(v)\big) \ge 2 \cdot 2^{-n-1} = 2^{-n}$ hence $v \notin B_n$ as the latter is a standard name of $X \setminus W^\circ$. This demonstrates that every $u \in A_m$ is an element of the right-hand side of Equation (6).

j) Fix a recursive name $(A_m)_m$ of $W$, a joint recursive time bound and binary modulus of continuity $\mu : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ of $\Lambda$ according to Theorem 7d), and uniformly recursive $\Lambda^\mu_n : A_{\mu(n)} \to \mathrm{dom}(\upsilon) \cap [2^{E(n)}]$ according to Remark 6h). Then the sets $\mathrm{graph}(\Lambda)_m :=$

$$\left\{ \left( \xi\Big(R(u,m)\Big), \upsilon\Big(S\big(\Lambda^\mu_{m+2}(u), m\big)\Big) \right) \;\middle|\; u \in A_{\mu(m+2)} \right\} \;\subseteq\; X \times Y$$

are of the form $(\xi \times \upsilon)[C_m]$ for uniformly recursive $C_m \subseteq [D(m) \cdot E(m)]$ and satisfy $(d \times e)_{\mathrm{H}}\big(\mathrm{graph}(\Lambda), \mathrm{graph}(\Lambda)_m\big) \le 2^{-m}$.
The converse claim follows from Theorem 10d). ■

### C. Exponential Objects and Higher-Type Computation

This subsection generalizes Theorem 7 uniformly, that is, with $(W, \Lambda)$ not fixed but given as input: taken from the Cartesian product (Example 5e) of the Hausdorff hyper-space $\mathcal{K}(X)$ over $X$ for $W$, and for $\Lambda : X \to Y$ from some closed hyper-space of *equi*continuous functions to another compact metric space $Y$: such as to render this new input space in turn compact (Fact 3c). The buzzword 'hyper' here stresses our climbing up the continuous type hierarchy:

*Remark 8:* For $(X, d)$ a compact metric space, and borrowing notation to hint at the dual of a topological *linear* space, write $(X', d_\infty)$ for the compact hyper-space $X' := \mathrm{Lip}_1(X, [0;1])$ of non-expansive real functions.

a) If $\mathrm{diam}(X) = 1$, then $X$ embeds isometrically into $X'$ via $\imath : x \mapsto d(x, \cdot)$.
b) In this sense, $X$ is a *proper* subset of $X'$ since there exists no isometry from $X'$ to $X$ for reasons of entropy: Consider $Z \subseteq X$ (non-empty and finite but) of maximum cardinality such that it holds $\forall z, z' \in Z : z = z' \vee d(z, z') \geq 1$. Then every $F : Z \to \{0, 1\}$ is 1-Lipschitz; and extends to some $\tilde{F} \in X'$ [Juut02], thus having mutual supremum distance $\geq 1$. This gives rise to $2^{\mathrm{Card}(Z)} > \mathrm{Card}(Z)$ distinct such $\tilde{F}$: Mapping them isometrically to $X$ would violate maximality of $Z \subseteq X$.
c) On the other hand every compact space, and in particular $X'$, is well-known homeomorphic to some compact subset of the Hilbert Cube $\prod_{j\in\mathbb{N}}[0; 2^{-j}] =: X$. So in this topological (rather than metric) sense $X'$ may actually admit an embedding into $X$.
d) For $X = [0; 1]^d$, however, $X'$ is not homeomorphic to (a subset of) $X$: Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and for $(y_1, \ldots, y_k) \in [0; 1]^k$ let $f_{\vec{y}} : [0; 1]^d \to [0; 1]$ denote the piecewise linear function with $f_{\vec{y}}(j/k, x_2, \ldots, x_d) \equiv y_j/k$. Then $\Psi_k : [0; 1]^k \ni \vec{y} \mapsto f_{\vec{y}} \in X'$ is well-defined, injective, and continuous: an embedding. An embedding $\Phi : X' \to X$ would thus yield a continuous injective $\Phi \circ \Psi_k : (0; 1)^k \to (0; 1)^d$; contradicting *Invariance of Domain* for $k > d$.

We now turn compact hyper-space $\mathcal{K}(X)$ into a computably compact metric space, such that any name of $W \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ in the sense of Definition 4d) is the binary encoding of a name of $W \subseteq X$ in the sense of Definition 4f), and vice versa:

*Definition 9:* a) For computably compact metric space $(X, d, \xi, D)$, consider $\big(\mathcal{K}(X), d_{\mathrm{H}}, \xi_{\mathrm{H}}, 2^D\big)$ with

$$\xi_{\mathrm{H}} :\subseteq \mathbb{N} \ni \sum\nolimits_{j\geq 0} b_j \cdot 2^j \ \mapsto\ \big\{\xi(j) : b_j = 1\big\} \ \in\ \mathcal{K}(X)$$

for $b_j \in \{0, 1\}$ in case $\emptyset \neq \{j : b_j = 1\} \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(\xi)$, $\sum_{j\geq 0} b_j \cdot 2^j \notin \mathrm{dom}\big(\xi_{\mathrm{H}}\big)$ otherwise.
b) Let $\mathcal{C}(\subseteq X, Y) := \bigcup_{W\in\mathcal{K}(X)} \mathcal{C}(W, Y)$ denote the set of partial functions $\Lambda :\subseteq X \to Y$ with *compact* domain; similarly for $\mathcal{C}_\mu(\subseteq X, Y)$. c) Consider the continuous embedding

$$\mathcal{C}(\subseteq X, Y) \ \ni\ \Lambda \ \mapsto\ \mathrm{graph}(\Lambda) \ \in\ \mathcal{K}(X \times Y)\ ,$$

justified by Fact 3g+h), by Theorem 7j), and particularly by Item e) of the following uniform result:

*Theorem 10:* Let $(X, d, \xi, D)$, $(Y, e, \upsilon, E)$ be computably compact metric spaces with recursive rounding functions.

a) The union mapping $\mathcal{K}(X) \times \mathcal{K}(X) \ni (V, W) \mapsto V \cup W \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ is computable.
b) The mappings $X \ni x \mapsto \{x\} \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ and $\mathcal{K}(X) \supseteq \big\{\{x\} : x \in X\big\} \ni \{x\} \mapsto x \in X$ are computable.
c) There is a computable mapping converting any given name of some $W \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ into a standard name of the same $W$.
d) For computable $W \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ and recursive strictly increasing $\mu : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, $\mathrm{graph}\big(\mathcal{C}_\mu(W, Y)\big)$ is a computable compact subset of $\mathcal{K}(X \times Y)$, i.e. a computable point in $\mathcal{K}\big(\mathcal{K}(X \times Y)\big)$.
e) Partial function evaluation is computable, that is, the mapping

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{K}(X \times Y) \times X \ \supseteq\\ &\big\{\big(\mathrm{graph}(\Lambda), x\big) \ \big|\ \Lambda \in \mathcal{C}(W, Y),\ W \in \mathcal{K}(X),\ x \in W\big\}\\ &\qquad \ni\ \big(\mathrm{graph}(\Lambda), x\big)\ \mapsto\ \Lambda(x)\ \in\ Y\ .\end{aligned}$$

f) The evaluation algorithm from (e) admits a uniformly computable multivalued runtime bound $T(\Lambda, n)$, i.e., depending only on $\Lambda$ and the output precision $n$, that is simultaneously a binary modulus of continuity:

$$\begin{aligned}T : \mathcal{K}(X \times Y) \times \mathbb{N}\ \supseteq\ \mathrm{graph}\big(\mathcal{C}(\subseteq X, Y)\big) \times \mathbb{N}\ \ni\\ \ni\ \big(\mathrm{graph}(\Lambda), n\big)\ \Rrightarrow\ m \in \mathbb{N} :\\ \forall x, x' \in \mathrm{dom}(\Lambda) :\ d(x, x') > 2^{-m} \vee e\big(\Lambda(x), \Lambda(x')\big) \leq 2^{-n}\end{aligned}$$

g) Function restriction is computable, i.e. the mapping

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{K}(X \times Y) \times \mathcal{K}(X)\ \supseteq\\ &\big\{\big(\mathrm{graph}(\Lambda), V\big)\ \big|\ \Lambda \in \mathcal{C}(W, Y),\ V, W \in \mathcal{K}(X),\ V \subseteq W\big\}\\ &\qquad \ni\ \big(\mathrm{graph}(\Lambda), V\big)\ \mapsto\ \mathrm{graph}\big(\Lambda\big|_V\big)\ =\\ &\qquad\qquad =\ \mathrm{graph}(\Lambda) \cap (V \times Y)\ \in\ \mathcal{K}(X \times Y)\ .\end{aligned}$$

h) Type conversion is also computable: partial evaluation

$$\mathcal{C}(\subseteq X \times Y, Z) \times X\ \ni\ (\Lambda, x)\ \mapsto\ \Lambda(x, \cdot)\ \in\ \mathcal{K}(\subseteq Y, Z)$$

as well as the converse, *un-*'Schönfinkeling' [Stra00, p.21].

j) And so is function image

$$\mathcal{C}(\subseteq X, Y) \times \mathcal{K}(X)\ \ni\ (\Lambda, W)\ \mapsto\ \Lambda[W]\ \in\ \mathcal{K}(Y)\ .$$

k) Suppose $\Phi : X \to Y$ is computable and *open* in that images $\Phi[U] \subseteq Y$ of open $U \subseteq X$ are open again. Then the restricted pre-image mapping

$$\mathcal{KR}(Y)\ \ni\ V\ \mapsto\ \Phi^{-1}[V]\ \in\ \mathcal{KR}(X)$$

is well-defined and computable.

Here we denote by $\mathcal{KR}(X) = \big\{W \subseteq X : W = \overline{W^\circ}\big\} \subseteq \mathcal{K}(X)$ the family of so-called *regular* subsets of $X$; recall Fact 1h) and Theorem 7h).

*Proof of Theorem 10k):* Preimage of a continuous open mapping commutes with topological closure and interior: $\Phi^{-1}\big[S^\circ\big] = \big(\Phi^{-1}[S]\big)^\circ$ and $\Phi^{-1}\big[\overline{S}\big] = \overline{\Phi^{-1}[S]}$; cmp. [Zieg02, LEMMA 4.4ab]. $\Phi^{-1}[V]$ is thus regular. Moreover both $W := \Phi^{-1}\big[V\big]$ and $\Phi^{-1}\big[Y \setminus V^\circ\big] = Y \setminus W^\circ$ are co-computable according to Theorem 7f); hence $W$ is computable by virtue of Theorem 7h). This argument is non-uniform, but closer inspection shows it to hold uniformly. ■

## III. APPLICATIONS

We apply the above considerations to two computational problems over compact metric spaces beyond the classical Euclidean case: a space of homeomorphisms (Subsection III-A), and the space of compact subsets (Subsection III-B).

### A. Fréchet Distance

In 1906 Maurice Fréchet introduced a pseudo-metric for parameterized continuous curves and, in 1924, for parameterized surfaces that in various ways improves over both supremum and Hausdorff Norm:

*Definition 11:* Let $(X,d)$, $(Y,e)$ be compact metric spaces.

a) The *Fréchet Distance* of two continuous mappings $A,B : X \to Y$ is given by $F(A,B) = \inf_\varphi F_{\mathrm{id},\varphi}(A,B)$, where

$$F_{\alpha,\beta}(A,B) := \sup_{x\in X} e\Big(A\big(\alpha(x)\big), B\big(\beta(x)\big)\Big) \qquad (7)$$

with infimum ranging over the set $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ of all homeomorphisms (i.e. continuous bijections) $\varphi : X \to X$.

b) For $X = [0;1]$, the *oriented* Fréchet Distance $F'(A,B)$ of continuous (not necessarily simple) curves $A,B : [0;1] \to Y$ is defined similarly with the infimum ranging over $\mathrm{Aut}'([0;1])$: the set of all strictly increasing continuous $\varphi : [0;1] \to [0;1]$ with $\varphi(0) = 0$ and $\varphi(1) = 1$.

c) For $X = \mathcal{S}^1$ the unit circle, the *oriented* Fréchet Distance $F'(A,B)$ of continuous loops $A,B : \mathcal{S}^1 \to Y$ is defined similarly with infimum ranging over $\mathrm{Aut}'(\mathcal{S}^1)$: the set of all clockwise continuous bijections $\varphi : \mathcal{S}^1 \to \mathcal{S}^1$.

d) For $X = \overline{B}^2$ the Euclidean unit disc, the *oriented* Fréchet Distance $F'(A,B)$ of continuous 2D surfaces $A,B : \mathcal{S}^1 \to Y$ is defined similarly with infimum ranging over $\mathrm{Aut}'\left(\overline{B}^2\right)$: the set of all continuous bijections $\varphi : \overline{B}^2 \to \overline{B}^2$ mapping some/all clockwise simple curves in $\overline{B}^2$ to clockwise image(s) [Alt09, DEFINITION 2].

e) More generally fix a $d$-dimensional orientable compact manifold $X$, i.e.,with $d$-th homology group $\mathrm{H}_d(X,\mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ [Munk84, COROLLARY 65.4]. For any homeomorphism $\varphi : X \to X$, the action of composition with $\varphi$ induces an isomorphism of the $k$-th homology group; which for $k = d$ can only be multiplication either by $-1$ or by $+1$; and the latter $\varphi$ by definition comprise $\mathrm{Aut}'(X)$.

The above notions have recently received much attention — in Computational Geometry, that is, for polygonal curves and triangulated surfaces; cf. for instance [AAB*16], [AHK*15], [BDS14], [Alt09], [Goda91] and both the references and motivating examples therein — as well as for the important

*Question 12:* Without restricting to piecewise/combinatorial inputs, can the Fréchet Distance(s) be computed in the sense of Recursive Analysis, that is, by approximation up to guaranteed absolute error $2^{-n}$ for every given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every given/fixed pair of continuous/computable functions $A,B$ ?

Theorem 14 below gives a positive answer for curves ($X = [0;1]$) and loops ($X = \mathcal{S}^1$) but also shows that an optimal reparametrization $\varphi$ cannot in general be computable.

Recall (Fact 3a) that compactness and continuity guarantee infimum (e.g. in Definition 2f) to exist, be attained, and computable according to Fact 1h) and Theorem 7g). Our goal is to argue similarly in Equation (7), only that the ground space here consists of functions $\varphi$. A first naïve attempt fails since $\mathrm{Aut}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{C}(X,X)$ is not compact and the infimum thus not necessarily attained:




Fig. 1. a) Two smooth simple curves $A,B : [0;1] \to [0;1]^2$ whose Fréchet Distance is not attained by any injective reparameterization $\varphi$. b) Two smooth simple curves $A,B : [0;1] \to [0;1]^2$ whose Fréchet Distance is attained by a continuum of reparameterizations $\varphi$.

*Remark 13:*

a) The pseudo-metric in Equation 7 is symmetric: $F_{\mathrm{id},\varphi}(A,B) = F_{\alpha\circ\beta,\alpha\circ\varphi\circ\beta}(A,B)$ holds for all bijections $\alpha,\beta : X \to X$, since the set $\big\{\big(x,\varphi(x)\big) : x \in X\big\}$ agrees with $\big\{\big(\alpha\circ\beta(y), \alpha\circ\varphi\circ\beta(y)\big) : y \in X\big\}$. However the inf over $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(X)$ in Definition 11 is in general 'attained' only by *non*-injective reparametrizations (Figure 1a).

b) On the other hand, the mapping $(\alpha,\varphi) \mapsto F_{\alpha,\varphi}(A,B)$ is uniformly continuous; namely has modulus of continuity the sum of those of $A$ and $B$. The sets $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ and $\mathrm{Aut}'(X)$ may thus be replaced by their topological closures, $\overline{\mathrm{Aut}(X)}$ and $\overline{\mathrm{Aut}'(X)}$ in $\mathcal{C}(X,X)$ as proper supersets, without affecting the value of $F$ and $F'$, respectively. However those closures still lack equicontinuity.

c) For the smooth simple curves $A,B : [0;1] \to [0;1]^2$ depicted in Figure 1b), their (non-/oriented) Fréchet Distance is attained by a continuum of homeomorphisms $\varphi : [0;1] \to [0;1]$, i.e., *non*-uniquely.

d) $\mathrm{Aut}([0;1])$ is the disjoint union of the path-connected subspace of increasing homeomorphisms, i.e. those in $\mathrm{Aut}'([0;1])$, and the decreasing ones; similarly for $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{S}^1)$. More generally, for any $d$-dimensional orientable compact manifold $X$, $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ decomposes into the locally arc-connected subspace $\mathrm{Aut}'(X)$ of orientation-preserving homeomorphisms and that of orientation-reversing ones [Sand60].

e) To every $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}'([0;1])$ there exist 2-Lipschitz $\psi,\chi \in \mathrm{Aut}'([0;1])$ such that $\varphi = \psi\circ\chi^{-1}$; similarly for the non-oriented case.

f) There exists a constant $K \geq 2$ such that every $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}'(\mathcal{S}^1)$ admits a decomposition $\varphi = \psi\circ\chi^{-1}$ with $K$-Lipschitz bijections $\psi,\chi \in \mathrm{Aut}'(\mathcal{S}^1)$; again, similarly for the non-oriented case.

g) There exists a constant $K \geq 2$ such that every Lipschitz-continuous $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}'\left(\overline{B}^d\right)$ admits a decomposition $\varphi = \alpha^{-1}\circ\beta\circ\gamma^{-1}\big|_{\overline{B}^d}$ with $K$-Lipschitz $\alpha,\beta,\gamma \in \mathrm{Aut}'\left(2\overline{B}^d\right)$; similarly for the non-oriented case. Here, using Minkowski operations, $\overline{B}^d + \overline{B}^d = 2\overline{B}^d = \overline{B}(0,2) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes the closed Euclidean ball around center 0 with radius 2.

h) Picking up on b), extend the definition of $F_{\alpha,\beta}(A,B)$ according to Equation (7) from continuous functions $\alpha,\beta : X \to X$ to compact relations $\alpha,\beta \subseteq X \times X$ as

$$\sup\big\{e\big(A(a),B(b)\big) \;\big|\; \exists x \in X : (x,a) \in \alpha, (x,b) \in \beta\big\} \ .$$

Then $(\alpha,\varphi) \mapsto F_{\alpha,\varphi}(A,B)$ still remains continuous w.r.t.

the Hausdorff metric on $\mathcal{K}(X\times X)\times\mathcal{K}(X\times X)$, and it holds $F(A,B)=\inf_\varphi F_{\mathrm{id},\varphi}(A,B)=\inf_{\alpha,\beta}F_{\alpha,\beta}(A,B)$ with infimum taken over $\overline{\mathrm{graph}(\mathrm{Aut}(X))}\subseteq\mathcal{K}(X\times X)$; similarly for $F'$ and $\mathrm{Aut}'(X)$: see Figure 2a).

For motivation, consider a bounded uniformly continuous functional $\Phi:\mathbb{P}\to\mathbb{R}$ on non-compact $\mathbb{P}=\{(\alpha,\varphi):\alpha,\varphi>0\}$ but satisfying 'scaling invariance' $\Phi(\alpha,\varphi)=\Phi(1,\varphi/\alpha)$. Then it obviously suffices to consider $(\alpha,\varphi)\in[0;1]^2$: a compact space. Items e+f+g) exhibit a similar property for $(\alpha,\varphi)\mapsto e_\infty(A\circ\alpha,B\circ\varphi)$, but without commutativity.

*Theorem 14:* Let $(Y,e,v,E)$ denote a computably compact space of $\mathrm{diam}(Y)\leq 1$.

a) The compact set $\mathrm{graph}\big(\overline{\mathrm{Lip}_2([0;1],[0;1])\cap\mathrm{Aut}'([0;1])}\big)\subseteq\mathcal{K}([0;1]^2)$ of graphs of non-decreasing 2-Lipschitz $\varphi:[0;1]\to[0;1]$ with $\varphi(0)=0$ and $\varphi(1)=1$ is computable.
b) Non/oriented Fréchet Distances between continuous paths $F,F':\mathcal{C}([0;1],Y)^2\to[0;1]$ are computable.
c) The same holds for non/oriented Fréchet Distances between continuous loops $F,F':\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S}^1,Y)^2\to[0;1]$.
d) There exist computable smooth $A,B:[0;1]\to[0;1]$ and strictly increasing homeomorphism $\varphi:[0;1]\to[0;1]$ such that $A=B\circ\varphi$ holds but no *computable* non-decreasing surjection $\varphi$ satisfies $A=B\circ\varphi$; nor does any computable non-increasing surjection $\varphi$.
e) There exist computable smooth *simple* (=injective) $\tilde A,\tilde B:[0;1]\to[0;2]^2$, codomain considered equipped with the 2D maximum norm, such that $F'(\tilde A,\tilde B)=1=F(\tilde A,\tilde B)$ is attained by some strictly increasing homeomorphism $\varphi:[0;1]\to[0;1]$ but by no *computable* non-decreasing/non-increasing surjection $\varphi$.

Regarding higher dimensions, [AlBu10, THEOREM 1] has asserted at least left/upper semi-computability; recall the paragraph following Fact 1: Computationally enumerating a sequence $\varphi_n$ dense in separable $\mathrm{Aut}(X)\subseteq\mathcal{C}(X,X)$, together with computability and continuity of $A,B,e_\infty$ yields a computable sequence $F_{\mathrm{id},\varphi_n}(A,B)$ whose infimum coincides with $F(A,B)$; and for $\varphi_n$ ranging over a compact space, its covering property asserts that finitely many (balls centered around) them suffice to approximate $F(A,B)$ also from below.

*Proof of Theorem 14:*

a) Recall that a name of continuous $\varphi:[0;1]\to[0;1]$ is a family of finite sets $C_m\subseteq\mathbb{D}_m\times\mathbb{D}_m$ approximating $\mathrm{graph}(\varphi)$ in Hausdorff metric. Now it is easy to enumerate, uniformly in $m\in\mathbb{N}$, all those $C_m$ satisfying the following condition: $C_m$ is a 'chain' of points in the sense of *Go* (aka 바둑), starting at the lower left corner and proceeding to the upper right such that at at least every second step 'up' is followed by one 'right'; see Figure 2b) illustrating the idea (that we deliberately refrain from formalizing further). Then the graph of every $\varphi\in\mathrm{Lip}_2([0;1],[0;1])\cap\mathrm{Aut}'([0;1])$ has Hausdorff distance at most $2^{-m}$ to some such $C_m$; and conversely every such $C_m$ has distance at most $2^{-m}$ to the graph of some $\varphi\in\mathrm{Lip}_2([0;1],[0;1])\cap\mathrm{Aut}'([0;1])$. The collection $\mathfrak{C}_m$ of all those $C_m\subseteq\mathbb{D}_m\times\mathbb{D}_m$, with $m\in\mathbb{N}$, thus constitutes a name of $\mathrm{graph}\big(\overline{\mathrm{Lip}_2([0;1],[0;1])\cap\mathrm{Aut}'([0;1])}\big)\subseteq\mathcal{K}([0;1]^2)$.
b) By Remark 13b+e), $F'(A,B)$ coincides with $\inf_{\chi,\psi}F_{\chi,\psi}(A,B)$, where the infimum ranges over the closet subset $\overline{\mathrm{Lip}_2([0;1],[0;1])\cap\mathrm{Aut}'([0;1])}\times\overline{\mathrm{Lip}_2([0;1],[0;1])\cap\mathrm{Aut}'([0;1])}$ of computably compact $\mathrm{Lip}_2([0;1],[0;1])\times\mathrm{Lip}_2([0;1],[0;1])$. Moreover said subset is computable by a); and so is the mapping $(\chi,\psi)\mapsto F_{\chi,\psi}(A,B)$ on it. Hence Theorem 7g) assert its image to be a computable subset of $[0;1]$, whose minimum is computable according to Fact 1j). The non-oriented case proceeds similary according to Remark 13d).
c) By Remark 13b+f) and regarding that $\mathrm{Lip}_K(\mathcal{S}^1,\mathcal{S}^1)\cap\mathrm{Aut}'(\mathcal{S}^1)\times\mathrm{Lip}_K(\mathcal{S}^1,\mathcal{S}^1)\cap\mathrm{Aut}'(\mathcal{S}^1)$ is a computable subset of computably compact $\mathrm{Lip}_K(\mathcal{S}^1,\mathcal{S}^1)\times\mathrm{Lip}_K(\mathcal{S}^1,\mathcal{S}^1)$ as domain of computable mapping $(\chi,\psi)\mapsto F_{\chi,\psi}(A,B)$ The non-oriented case proceeds similary. ■




Fig. 2. a) Example of convergence in Hausdorff (graph) but not Supremum (function) norm. b) Illustrating the proof of Theorem 14a).

*Proof of Remark 13:*

e) Let $\varphi$ be non-decreasing. Then the continuous and surjective mapping $\tilde\varphi:[0;1]\ni t\mapsto\big(t+\varphi(t)\big)/2\in[0;1]$ satisfies, for $t\geq t'$,

$$\tilde\varphi(t)-\tilde\varphi(t')=(t-t')/2+\big(\varphi(t)-\varphi(t')\big)/2\geq(t-t')/2$$

and hence is strictly increasing with 2-Lipschitz inverse $\chi\in\mathrm{Aut}'([0;1])$. It remains to observe that $\psi:=\varphi\circ\chi$ is 2-Lipschitz since, again for $t\geq t'$,

$$\psi\big(\tfrac{t+\varphi(t)}{2}\big)-\psi\big(\tfrac{t'+\varphi(t')}{2}\big)=\varphi(t)-\varphi(t')\leq$$
$$\leq\varphi(t)-\varphi(t')+t-t'=2\cdot\big(\tfrac{t+\varphi(t)}{2}-\tfrac{t'+\varphi(t')}{2}\big)\ .$$

f) Applying an isometric rotation we may w.l.o.g. suppose $\varphi(1)=1$. Since $\mathcal{S}^1$ is homeomorphic to $[0;1)\mod 1$, this reduces to e).
g) According to f), the restriction of $\varphi$ to the ball's boundary admits a decomposition $\varphi\big|_{\mathcal{S}^1}=\psi\circ\chi^{-1}$ with $K$-Lipschitz homeomorphisms $\psi,\chi:\mathcal{S}^1\to\mathcal{S}^1$. Note that $\vec x\mapsto\vec x/|\vec x|_2$ is $L$-Lipschitz outside the Euclidean disk $B^d(0,1/L)$ of radius $1/L$. Thus, applying *Alexander's Trick*, $\chi$ extends radially to a $2K$-Lipschitz homeomorphism of entire $\overline{B}^2$,

and of $2\overline{B}^2$, via $\chi(\vec{x}) := \chi(\vec{x}/|\vec{x}|_2)\cdot|\vec{x}|$. So $\varphi\circ\chi\big|_{\overline{B}^2} \in \mathrm{Aut}(\overline{B}^2)$ coincides on $\mathcal{S}^1$ with $\psi$ and in particular is $2K$-Lipschitz there. Now abbreviate $L := 2K$ and define

$$\beta : \vec{x} \mapsto \begin{cases} \varphi\circ\chi(\vec{x})/L & : |\vec{x}|_2 \leq 1 \\ b_L(|\vec{x}|_2)\cdot\varphi\circ\chi(\vec{x}/|\vec{x}|_2) & : |\vec{x}|_2 \geq 1 \end{cases},$$

$$\tilde{\alpha} : \vec{y} \mapsto \begin{cases} \vec{y}\cdot L & : |\vec{y}|_2 \leq 1/L \\ a_L(|\vec{y}|_2)\cdot\vec{y}/|\vec{y}|_2 & : |\vec{y}|_2 \geq 1/L \end{cases}$$

for affine $b_L(r) := (2-1/L)\cdot r - 2 + 2/L$ and $a_L(s) := \frac{L\cdot s+2L-2}{2L-2}$; cmp. Figure 5. Then, $b_L : \big[1;2\big] \to \big[\frac{1}{L};2\big]$ constituting an increasing bijection, implies that $\beta : 2\overline{B}^d \to 2\overline{B}^d$ is well-defined, continuous, injective, surjective, and $2L$-Lipschitz. Similarly, $a_L : \big[\frac{1}{L};2\big] \to \big[1;2\big]$ constituting an increasing bijection, implies that $\tilde{\alpha} : 2\overline{B}^d \to 2\overline{B}^d$ is well-defined, continuous, injective, and surjective with $2L$-Lipschitz inverse $\alpha := \tilde{\alpha}^{-1}$ since $a_L\circ b_L = \mathrm{id}_{[1;2]}$. Finally, $\varphi\circ\chi = \tilde{\alpha}\circ\beta\big|_{\overline{B}^d}$ is easily verified. ■

### B. Shape Optimization

This subsection exhibits weak conditions that assert computability of the following generic optimization problem:

*Definition 15:* For fixed $X$ and given $\Lambda, \Phi : X \to \mathbb{R}$, determine the real number $r := \max\Lambda\Big[\Phi^{-1}\big[(-\infty;0]\big]\Big]$, provided it exists. $\Lambda$ is the *objective function*, $r$ its *optimum* w.r.t. *constraint* $\Phi \leq 0$, the latter called *feasible* if $0 \in \Phi[X]$.

To guarantee said existence, it suffices that (i) $X$ be compact, (ii) $\Lambda$ be continuous, and (iii) $\Phi$ be lower semi-continuous: Condition (iii) asserts that the non-empty domain $\Phi^{-1}\big[(-\infty;0]\big] \subseteq X$ is closed and thus compact by (i), hence (ii) $\Lambda$ attains its maximum on it. Conversely simple counterexamples show that none of the three conditions can in general be omitted.

*Example 16:*

a) Linear Optimization refers, up to scaling, to the case $X = [0;1]^d$ with $\Lambda : X \to \mathbb{R}$ linear together with a finite conjunction of (w.l.o.g. non-constant) linear constraints $\Phi_j : \vec{x} \mapsto b_j + \vec{x}\cdot\vec{a}_j^+$, $\vec{a}_j \neq 0$, collected into the single $\Phi := \max_j \Phi_j$. Note that $\Lambda$ and $\Phi$ are continuous, and $\Phi$ is furthermore open.
b) Convex Optimization refers, again up to scaling, to the case $X = [0;1]^d$ but now permits the generalization to convex negated objective functions $-\Lambda : X \to \mathbb{R}$ and non-constant constraints $\Phi_j$, again subsumed in the (still convex) single $\max_j \Phi_j$.
c) In Discrete Optimization, $X$ is a finite but 'large' set. Equipped with the discrete topology, it renders every $\Lambda, \Phi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ continuous.
d) *Shape Optimization* refers, again up to scaling, to the case $X = \mathcal{K}([0;1]^d)$ with $\Lambda, \Phi \in \mathcal{C}(X)$; cmp. [HePi05].
e) The (Lebesgues) measure, considered as mapping $\mathrm{Vol}_1 : \mathcal{KR}([0;1]) \to [0;1]$, is upper semi-continuous but not continuous nor computable.

Recall $\mathcal{KR}(X) = \big\{W \subseteq X : W = \overline{W^\circ}\big\}$. For a fixed convex compact subset $X$ of a Fréchet (i.e. complete translation invariant metric vector) space, write $\mathcal{KC}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(X)$ for the family of its convex compact non-empty subsets.

Shape Optimization has recently grown a hot topic in Numerical Engineering [SoZo99] but generally lacks mathematical specification and rigorous algorithmic analysis. We establish that this, as well as the generic optimization problem from Definition 15, is computable for (i') computably compact metric space $X$, (ii') computable objective function and (iii') open computable constraint:

*Theorem 17:* Let $(X, d, \xi, D)$ and $(Y, e, \upsilon, E)$ denote computably compact metric spaces.

a) For $X$ any convex compactly computable subset of Euclidean space with non-empty interior, $\mathcal{KC}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(X)$ is in turn computably compact.
b) The generic optimization problem

$$\mathcal{C}(X,[0;1]) \times \big(\mathcal{C}(X,[-1;1]) \cap \mathcal{O}_0(X)\big) \ni$$
$$\ni\ (\Lambda,\Phi)\ \mapsto\ \max\Lambda\Big[\Phi^{-1}\big[[-1;0]\big]\Big]\ \in\ [0;1]$$

is computable, where $\mathcal{O}_0(X)$ denotes the family of open $\Phi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ with $0 \in \Phi[X]$.
c) As opposed to Example 16e), the mapping $\mathrm{Vol}_d : \mathcal{KC}\big([0;1]^d\big) \to [0;1]$ is (continuous and) computable.
d) The mapping $\mathcal{KC}\big([0;1]^d\big) \ni W \mapsto \mathrm{Area}_{d-1}(\partial W) \in [0;2d]$ is well-defined, open, (continuous and) computable, where $\mathrm{Area}_{d-1}(\partial W)$ denotes the area measure of $W$'s boundary.

Claim a) is a minor strengthening of *Blaschke's Selection Theorem*; b) follows by combining Theorem 10j+k) with Fact 1j) since $[-1;0]$ is regular.

As an example 'application', consider the classical *Isoperimetric Problem* asking to maximize $\mathrm{Vol}_d(W)$ subject to the constraint $\mathrm{Area}(\partial W) - 1 \leq 0$, say. Combining the items of Theorem 17, we conclude that the solution is computable!

On second thought this comes at no surprise, though: Knowing that the optimal shape is a Euclidean ball, the solution is easily calculated explicitly as $1/(4\pi)$ in dimension 2, $1/(6\sqrt{\pi})$ in dimension 3, and similar expressions can be derived in any dimension $d$ involving the gamma function at half-integral arguments.

## IV. Conclusion and Perspectives

For computably compact metric spaces $(X, d, \xi, D)$ and $(Y, e, \upsilon, E)$ in the sense of Definition 4, we have (i) turned the hyper-space $\mathcal{K}(X)$ of non-empty compact subsets of $X$ into computably compact metric space, again; and (ii) similarly for the space $\mathcal{C}_\mu(W, Y)$ of partial equicontinuous functions $\Lambda : W \to Y$ having non-empty compact domain $W \subseteq X$. The latter proceeds by identifying such $\Lambda$ with $\mathrm{graph}(\Lambda) \in \mathcal{K}(X \times Y)$; and was shown to render evaluation uniformly computable. This generalizes well-known results for the Euclidean, to arbitrary compact metric, spaces – including a hierarchy of higher types.

*Perspectives*

a) Definition 4b) employs dense enumerations, that is, surjective partial mappings from $\mathbb{N}$. When categorically constructing enumerations of the Cartesian product (Example 5d) and Hausdorff hyperspace (Example 5e), we thus had to 'flatten' back the domain of the enumeration: which works from the perspective of computability, but is unnatural and complexity-theoretically superseded [KaCo10]. Future work will instead choose a suitable axiomatized category of discrete ground spaces.

b) Speaking of complexity, we will refine the above computability investigations to quantitative upper and (using adversary arguments in the bit-cost model) lower complexity bounds in terms of the separation parameter $\eta$ from Definition 4; cmp. [ZhMü08], [KaCo10], [Roes14], [KSZ16], [Stei16].

c) Encoding continuous functions via their graphs generalizes to closed relations aka multi-(valued)functions [PaZi13] known essential in computing on continuous data. Regarding Remark 8c+d), we don't know whether $[0;1]''$ is homeomorphic to (a subset) of $[0;1]'$.

d) Computability of the 2D Fréchet Distance remains elusive — until we can establish computability of the compact set $\overline{\{\operatorname{graph}(\operatorname{Aut}([0;1]^2))\}} \subseteq \mathcal{K}([0;1]^4)$; recall Remark 13h). This boils down to the following question:

e) Given a subset of $\mathbb{D}_n^4$, (how) can we decide whether it has Hausdorff distance $\leq 2^{-n}$ to the graph of any $\varphi \in \operatorname{Aut}([0;1]^2)$ ?

We thank Akitoshi Kawamura, Matthias Schröder, and Florian Steinberg for seminal discussions.

## REFERENCES


[AAB*16] H.-K. AHN, H. ALT, M. BUCHIN, E. OH, L. SCHARF, C. WENK: "A Middle Curve Based on Discrete Frchet Distance" pp.14–26 in *Proc. 12th Latin American Theoretical Informatics* (LATIN 2016), Springer LNCS vol.**9644**.

[AHK*15] B. ARONOV, S. HAR-PELED, C. KNAUER, Y. WANG, C. WENK: "Fréchet Distance for Curves, Revisited", http://arXiv.org/abs/1504.07685 (2015)

[AlBu10] H. ALT, M. BUCHIN: "Can We Compute the Similarity between Surfaces?", pp.78–99 in *Discr.&Comput.Geom.* vol.**43:1** (2010).

[Alt09] H. ALT: "The Computational Geometry of Comparing Shapes", pp.235–248 in *Festschrift Mehlhorn*, Springer LNCS vol.**5760**.

[BDS14] M. BUCHIN, A. DRIEMEL, B. SPECKMANN: "Computing the Fréchet distance with shortcuts is NP-hard", pp.367–376 in *Proc. 30th Ann. Symp. Computational Geometry* (SoCG'14).

[Bra05] M. BRAVERMAN: "On the Complexity of Real Functions", pp.155–164 in *Proc. 46th Ann. IEEE Symp. on Foundations of Computer Science* (FoCS'05).

[BrPr03] V. BRATTKA, G. PRESSER: "Computability on subsets of metric spaces", pp.43–76 in *Theoretic.Computer Science* vol.**305** (2003).

[BrWe99] V. BRATTKA, K. WEIHRAUCH: "Computability on subsets of Euclidean space I: Closed and compact subsets", pp.65–93 in *Theoretical Computer Science* vol.**219** (1999).

[Esca13] M.H. ESCARDÓ: "Algorithmic Solution of Higher-Type Equations", pp.839–854 in *J. Logic and Computation* vol.**23:4** (2013).

[Goda91] M. GODAU: "A Natural Metric for Curves — Computing the Distance for Polygonal Chains and Approximation Algorithms", pp.127–136 in *Proc. 8th Ann. Symp. Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science* (STACS'91).

[HePi05] A. HENROT, M. PIERRE: *Variation et Optimisation de Formes: Une analyse géometrique*, Springer (2005).

[Juut02] P. JUUTINEN: "Absolutely Minimizing Lipschitz Extensions on an Metric Space", pp.57–67 in *Annales Academiæ Scientiarum Fennicæ Mathematica*, vol.**27** (2002).

[KaCo10] A. KAWAMURA, S.A. COOK: "Complexity Theory for Operators in Analysis", article 5 in *ACM Transactions in Computation Theory* vol.**4:2** (2012).

[Kech95] A.S. KECHRIS: *Classical Descriptive Set Theory*, Springer GTM vol.**156** (1995).

[Ko91] K.-I. KO: *Computational Complexity of Real Functions*, Birkhäuser (1991).

[Kohl08] U. KOHLENBACH: *Applied Proof Theory*, Springer (2008).

[KrWe87] C. KREITZ, K. WEIHRAUCH: "Compactness in Constructive Analysis Revisited", pp.29–38 in *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* vol.**36** (1987).

[KSZ16] A. KAWAMURA, F. STEINBERG, M. ZIEGLER: "Complexity Theory of (Functions on) Compact Metric Spaces", pp.837–846 in *Proc.31st Ann.ACM/IEEE Symp. Logic in Comp.Sci.* (LiCS'16).

[Mayo16] E. MAYORDOMO: "Effective Hausdorff dimension in general metric spaces", submitted (2016).

[Munk84] J.R. MUNKRES: *Elements of Algebraic Topology*, Addison-Wesley (1984).

[LoNo15] J. LONGLEY, D. NORMANN: *Higher-Order Computability*, Springer (2015).

[Paul16] A. PAULY: "On the topological aspects of the theory of represented spaces", pp.159–180 in *Computability* vol.**5** (2016).

[PaZi13] A. PAULY, M. ZIEGLER: "Relative Computability and Uniform Continuity of Relations", vol.**5** in the *Journal of Logic and Analysis* (2013).

[PERi89] M.B. POUR-EL, J.I. RICHARDS: "*Computability in Analysis and Physics*", Springer (1989).

[Roes14] C. RÖSNICK: "Closed Sets and Operators thereon: Representations, Computability and Complexity", extended abstract presented at the *10th Int. Conf. on Computability and Complexity in Analysis*; full version submitted.

[Roye97] J.S. ROYER: "Semantics vs. syntax vs. computations: machine models for type-2 polynomial-time bounded functionals", pp.424–436 in *J. Comput. System Sci.* vol.**54** (1997).

[Rudi76] W. RUDIN: *Principles of Mathematical Analysis* (3rd Ed.), McGraw-Hill (1976).

[Sand60] D.E. SANDERSON: "Isotopy in 3-Manifolds III: Connectivity of Spaces of Homeomorphisms", pp. 171–176 in *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* vol.**11** (1960).

[Schr04] M. SCHRÖDER: "Spaces Allowing Type-2 Complexity Theory Revisited", pp.443–459 in *Mathemat.Logic Quarterly* vol.**50** (2004).

[Schr09] M. SCHRÖDER: "The sequential topology on $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}}$ is not regular", pp.943–957 in *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* vol.**19:5** (2009).

[Soar16] R.I. SOARE: *Turing Computability: Theory and Applications*, Springer (2016).

[SoZo99] J. SOKOLOWSKI, A. ZOCHOWSKI: "On the Topological Derivative in Shape Optimization", pp.1251–1272 in *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* vol.**37:4** (1999).

[Stei16] F. STEINBERG: "Complexity Theory for Spaces of Integrable Functions", submitted; preprint http://arXiv.org/abs/1612.06419 (2016).

[Stra00] C. STRACHEY: "Fundamental Concepts in Programming Languages", reprinted lecture notes from 1967, pp.11–49 in *Higher-Order and Symbolic Computation* vol.**13** (2000).

[Weih00] K. WEIHRAUCH: *Computable Analysis*, Springer (2000).

[Weih03] K. WEIHRAUCH: "Computational Complexity on Computable Metric Spaces", pp.3–21 in *Math.Logic Quarterly* vol.**49:1** (2003).

[ZhMü08] X. ZHAO, N.T. MÜLLER: "Complexity of Operators on Compact Sets", pp.101–119 in *Proc. 4th Int. Conf. on Computability and Complexity in Analysis* (CCA'07), vol.**202** (2008).

[Zieg02] M. ZIEGLER: "Computable Operators on Euclidean Sets", pp.392–404 in *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* vol.**50** (2004).

## APPENDIX

*Proof of Fact 3:*

a) See [Rudi76, THEOREMS 3.11+2.35+4.16].
b) See [Rudi76, THEOREMS 4.14+4.19].
c) See [Rudi76, THEOREM 7.25], cmp. also [KSZ16, LEMMA 13d].
e) See [Kech95, THEOREM 4.26].
f) $x_{\xi,D}$ is obviously closed in Baire space; and so is $W_{\xi,D}$: If $x_k$ is a sequence in $W$ and $\bar{u}^{(k)} \in x_{k,\xi,D}$ converges to some $\bar{u}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$, then triangle inequality yields

$$d(x_k, x_\ell) \leq d\big(x_k, \xi(u_m^{(k)})\big) + d\big(\xi(u_m^{(k)}), x_\ell\big) \leq 2^{-m} + 2^{-m}$$

for all $\ell, k$ so large such that $\beta\big(\bar{u}^{(k)}, \bar{u}^{(\ell)}\big) < 2^{-m}$ hence $u_m^{(k)} = u_m^{(\ell)} = u_m^{(0)}$. Thus $(x_k)$ constitutes a Cauchy sequence in compact $W$, converging by (a) to some $x_0 \in W$. To see $\bar{u}^{(0)} \in x_{0,\xi,D}$, observe

$$2^{-m} \geq d\big(x_k, \xi(u_m^{(k)})\big) = d\big(x_k, \xi(u_m^{(0)})\big) \overset{k\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} d\big(x_0, \xi(u_m^{(0)})\big)$$

Regarding relative compactness, record that the sets $x_{\xi,D,m}$ are finite, in fact of cardinality bounded by $D(m)$ independently of $x \in X$. Therefore an inital segment $(u_0, \ldots, u_{m-1})$ of any $\bar{u} \in x_{\xi,D}$ can have no more than $D(m)$ possible successors $u_m$. This asserts that the set $X^*_{\xi,D}$ of finite initial segments of elements in $X_{\xi,D}$ constitute a finitely branching subtree of $\mathbb{N}^*$. Now apply (d).
g) Triangle inequality of $d \times e$ and compactness of $X \times Y$ are immediate. If $f$ is continuous and $\big(x_n, f(x_n)\big)$ a sequence in $\mathrm{graph}(f)$, then compactness of $X$ yields a convergent subsequence $x_{n_k} \to x \in X$, and $f(x_{n_k}) \to f(x)$ by continuity. Conversely, the pre-image $f^{-1}[V]$ of any closed $V \subseteq Y$ coincides with $\pi_1\big[(X \times V) \cap \mathrm{graph}(f)\big] \subseteq X$ and thus is closed, where $\pi_1(x, y) := x$ denotes the continuous and closed projection map and $(X \times V) \cap \mathrm{graph}(f) \subseteq X \times Y$ is closed.
h) For every $\big(x, f(x)\big) \in \mathrm{graph}(f)$, $\big(x, g(x)\big) \in \mathrm{graph}(g)$ has $(d \times e)$-distance $e\big(f(x), g(x)\big) \leq e_\infty(f, g)$. Conversely, to every $x \in X$ there exists some $x' \in X$ such that $d(x, x'), e\big(f(x), g(x')\big) \leq (d \times e)_{\mathrm{H}}\big(\mathrm{graph}(f), \mathrm{graph}(g)\big)$; hence, for $\omega$ a modulus of continuity of $g$,

$$\begin{aligned} e\big(f(x), g(x)\big) \;&\leq \\ &\leq\; e\big(f(x), g(x')\big) \;+\; e\big(g(x'), g(x)\big) \;\leq \\ &\leq\; (d \times e)_{\mathrm{H}}\big(\mathrm{graph}(f), \mathrm{graph}(g)\big) \;+\; \omega\big(d(x', x)\big) \;. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, uniform convergence $\mathcal{F} \ni f_n \to f$ implies $\mathrm{graph}(f_n) \to \mathrm{graph}(f)$ in Hausdorff distance; and $\mathrm{graph}(f_n) \to \mathrm{graph}(f)$ with $f \in \mathcal{C}(X, Y)$ implies $f_n \to f$ in uniform norm according to b). ■

*Proof of Remark 13b):*

$$\begin{aligned} &|e_\infty(A \circ \alpha, B \circ \varphi) - e_\infty(A \circ \tilde{\alpha}, B \circ \tilde{\varphi})| \;\leq \\ &\quad\leq\; |e_\infty(A \circ \alpha, B \circ \varphi) - e_\infty(A \circ \alpha, B \circ \tilde{\varphi})| \;+ \\ &\quad+\; |e_\infty(A \circ \alpha, B \circ \tilde{\varphi}) - e_\infty(A \circ \tilde{\alpha}, B \circ \tilde{\varphi})| \\ &\quad\leq\; e_\infty(B \circ \varphi, B \circ \tilde{\varphi}) + e_\infty(A \circ \alpha, A \circ \tilde{\alpha}) \\ &\quad\leq\; \omega_B\big(e_\infty(\varphi, \tilde{\varphi})\big) + \omega_A\big(e_\infty(\alpha, \tilde{\alpha})\big) \end{aligned}$$

by reverse triangle inequality for moduli of continuity $\omega_A, \omega_B$ of $A, B$ respectively. ■

*Proof of Theorem 10:*

a) similarly to the proof of Theorem 7a).
b) similarly to the proof of Theorem 7b+c).
c) similarly to the proof of Remark 6f).
d) similarly to the proof of Theorem 7j).
e) Let $(u_m)$ with $u_m \in \mathrm{dom}(\xi) \cap [2^{D(m)}]$ be a given name of $x \in W$ and $(C_m)$ with $C_m \subseteq \big(\mathrm{dom}(\xi) \cap [2^{D(m)}]\big) \times \big(\mathrm{dom}(\upsilon) \cap [2^{E(m)}]\big)$ one of $\mathrm{graph}(\Lambda) \subseteq X \times Y$ for some continuous $\Lambda : W \to Y$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, search for, and output, some $v_n \in \mathrm{dom}(\upsilon) \cap [2^{E(n)}]$ such that there exists an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall (u', v') \in C_m : \quad & d\big(\xi(u_m), \xi(u')\big) > 2^{-m+1} \vee \\ & \vee\; e\big(\upsilon(v_n), \upsilon(v')\big) < 2^{-n} - 2^{-m} \;. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

First, Property (8) is obviously r.e.. Second, any $v_n$ found satisfies $e\big(\upsilon(v_n), y\big) < 2^{-n}$ for $y := \Lambda(x)$ with $x \in W$ s.t. $d\big(\xi(u_m), x\big) \leq 2^{-m}$: $(d \times e)_{\mathrm{H}}\big(\mathrm{graph}(\Lambda), C_m\big) \leq 2^{-m}$ with $(x, y) \in \mathrm{graph}(\Lambda)$ yields some $(u', v') \in C_m$ with $d\big(\xi(u'), x\big), e\big(\upsilon(v'), y\big) \leq 2^{-m}$; hence $d\big(\xi(u_m), \xi(u')\big) \leq 2^{-m+1}$ by triangle inequality, so the second part of Property (8) applies. Third, there exists some $v_n \in \mathrm{dom}(\upsilon) \cap [2^{E(n)}]$ with $e\big(\upsilon(v_n), y\big) \leq 2^{-n-1}$; and, as $\Lambda$ is defined and continuous at $x$, there is some $m \geq n + 3$ such that every $x' \in W$ with $d(x, x') \leq 2^{-m+2}$ satisfies $e\big(y, \Lambda(x')\big) \leq 2^{-n-2}$. In particular every $(u', v') \in C_m$ with $d\big(\xi(u_m), \xi(u')\big) \leq 2^{-m+1}$, having $d\big(\xi(u'), x'\big), e\big(\xi(v'), \Lambda(x')\big) \leq 2^{-m}$ for some $x' \in W$ implies $e\big(\upsilon(v_n), \upsilon(v')\big) \leq$

$$\begin{aligned} e\big(\upsilon(v_n), y\big) \;+\; e\big(y, \Lambda(x')\big) \;+\; e\big(\Lambda(x'), v'\big) \;\leq \\ \leq\; 2^{-n-1} + 2^{-n-2} + 2^{-m} \;\leq\; 2^{-n} - 2^{-m} \;. \end{aligned}$$

f) Observe that Theorem 7d+e) relativizes: For any oracle $\mathfrak{O}$, if $W \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ is (co-)computable with $\mathfrak{O}$ and $\Lambda : W \to Y$ is computable with $\mathfrak{O}$, then $\Lambda$ has a runtime bound/binary modulus of continuity $T(\Lambda, \cdot) : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ computable with $\mathfrak{O}$. Now for $\mathfrak{O}$ encoding names of $W$ and $\Lambda$, any query made by the oracle machine computing said $T(\Lambda, \cdot)$ can be answered by performing a look-up on the input $\mathrm{graph}(\Lambda)$. For instance the projection (of a name of) $\mathrm{graph}(\Lambda) \subseteq X \times Y$ onto $X$ yields (a name of) $\mathrm{dom}(\Lambda) = W$.
g) By c) w.l.o.g. let $(A_m)$ denote a given *standard* name of $V \subseteq W$ and $(B_m)$ one of $\mathrm{graph}(\Lambda) \subseteq X \times Y$, where $\Lambda : W \to Y$ has binary modulus of continuity $\mu$ according to f). Abbreviate $n := \mu(m + 2) + 1 \geq m + 2$ and verify

$$C_m \;:=\; \big\{\big(R(u, m), S(v, m)\big) \;\big|\; (u, v) \in B_n,\; u \in A_n\big\}$$

constituting a name of $\mathrm{graph}(\Lambda|_V)$: To every $(x,y) \in \mathrm{graph}(\Lambda|_V)$ there exist $u \in \mathrm{dom}(\xi) \cap [2^{D(n)}]$ and $v \in \mathrm{dom}(\upsilon) \cap [2^{E(n)}]$ with $d\big(x,\xi(u)\big), e\big(y,\upsilon(v)\big) \leq 2^{-n-1} \leq 2^{-m-1}$; hence $u \in A_n$ and $(u,v) \in B_n$: since these are standard names. Then $u' := R(u,m)$ and $v' := S(v,m)$ with $(u',v') \in C_m$ have $d\big(\xi(u'),\xi(u)\big), e\big(\upsilon(v'),\upsilon(v)\big) \leq 2^{-m-1}$, so $(d \times e)\big((\xi(u'),\upsilon(v')),(x,y)\big) \leq 2^{-m}$.
Conversely, to every $(u',v') \in C_m$ there exist by definition $(u,v) \in B_n$ with $u \in A_n$ such that $d\big(\xi(u'),\xi(u)\big), e\big(\upsilon(v'),\upsilon(v)\big) \leq 2^{-m-1}$; and $(x,y) \in \mathrm{graph}(\Lambda)$ as well as $x' \in V$ with $d\big(x',\xi(u)\big), d\big(x,\xi(u)\big), e\big(y,\upsilon(v)\big) \leq 2^{-n}$. Hence $d(x,x') \leq 2^{-n+1} = 2^{-\mu(m)}$ implies $e(y',y) \leq 2^{-m-2}$ for $y' := \Lambda(x')$; and therefore it holds $d\big(x',\xi(u')\big) \leq 2^{-n} + 2^{-m-1} \leq 2^{-m}$ as well as $e\big(y',\upsilon(v')\big) \leq 2^{-m-2} + 2^{-n} + 2^{-m-1} \leq 2^{-m}$.

h) Similar to g) and Theorem 7j), respectively.

j) Similar to Theorem 7g). ■




Fig. 3. Illustrating the proof Theorem 14d)

*Proof of Theorem 14:*

d) Let $\alpha, \beta : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ denote total recursive injective enumerations of recursively inseparable sets $\alpha[\mathbb{N}], \beta[\mathbb{N}] \subseteq \mathbb{N}$; cmp. [Soar16, EXERCISE 1.6.26]. Intuitively, although inputs $m \notin \alpha[\mathbb{N}] \cup \beta[\mathbb{N}]$ may be accepted or rejected arbitrarily, provably no total algorithm can make such a decision.
Now for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ abbreviate $z(m) := 0$ for $m \notin \alpha[\mathbb{N}] \uplus \beta[\mathbb{N}]$ and $z(m) := 2^{-m^2-\min\{k:\alpha(k)=m \vee \beta(k)=m\}}$ otherwise: a computable sequence of real numbers; and so is $x(m)$, defined as $z(m)$ if $m \in \alpha[\mathbb{N}]$ and $x(m) := 0$ otherwise; and $y(m) := z(m)$ if $m \in \beta[\mathbb{N}]$ and $y(m) := 0$ otherwise. Next consider the computable 1-Lipschitz 'hat' function $\psi(x) = \max\{0, 1-|x|\}$ or the computable smooth 'pulse' function $\tilde{\psi}(x) = \exp\big(-\frac{1}{1-x^2}\big)$ for $|x| \leq 1$, $\tilde{\psi}(x) :\equiv 0$ for $|x| \geq 1$: both have support $[-1;1]$, see Figure 3. Finally define $A(x)$ and $B(x)$, respectively, as

$$\sum_m \tilde{\psi}\big(2^{m+3} \cdot x - 7\big)/2^{m+3} \; + \; \tilde{\psi}\big(2^{m+4} \cdot x - 10\big) \cdot z(m),$$

$$\sum_m \tilde{\psi}\big(2^{m+3} \cdot x - 7\big)/2^{m+3} \; + \; \tilde{\psi}\big(2^{m+5} \cdot x - 19\big) \cdot x(m) \; + \; \tilde{\psi}\big(2^{m+5} \cdot x - 21\big) \cdot y(m)$$

and note that all terms in each sum have disjoint supports. Moreover, the thus well-defined $A, B : [0;1] \to [0;1]$ are continuous (particularly at 0) and even smooth, since the $d$-th derivative of the $m$-th term is bounded by $z_m \cdot (2^{m+4})^d \leq 2^{-m^2+dm+4d} \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$. Next, it holds $A = B \circ \varphi$ for the increasing continuous surjection $\varphi : [0;1] \to [0;1]$ mapping the closed interval $\big[6 \cdot 2^{-m-3}; 11 \cdot 8 \cdot 2^{-m-3}\big]$ isometrically to $\big[6 \cdot 2^{-m-3}; 11 \cdot 8 \cdot 2^{-m-3}\big]$ to match the 'large' pulses as well as the 'small' ones by mapping $\big[9 \cdot 2^{-m-4}; 11 \cdot 2^{-m-4}\big]$ to $\big[17 \cdot 2^{-m-5}; 21 \cdot 2^{-m-5}\big]$ in case $m \in \alpha[\mathbb{N}]$ and to $\big[19 \cdot 2^{-m-5}; 23 \cdot 2^{-m-5}\big]$ in case $m \in \beta[\mathbb{N}]$; arbitrarily in case $m \notin \alpha[\mathbb{N}] \cup \beta[\mathbb{N}]$. Conversely, no non-increasing surjective $\varphi$ can make the large pulses match nor satisfy $B = A \circ \varphi$; and any non-decreasing $\varphi$ that does, must necessarily map $10 \cdot 2^{-m-4}$ to $19 \cdot 2^{-m-5}$ in case $m \in \alpha[\mathbb{N}]$, to $21 \cdot 2^{-m-5}$ in case $m \in \beta[\mathbb{N}]$, and anywhere in $\big[8 \cdot 2^{-m-4}; 12 \cdot 2^{-m-4}\big]$ in case $m \notin \alpha[\mathbb{N}] \cup \beta[\mathbb{N}]$. A computable such (total!) $\varphi$ would allow for a recursive separation of $\alpha[\mathbb{N}]$ from $\beta[\mathbb{N}]$: Given $m \in \mathbb{N}$, accept if the $2^{-m-6}$-approximation to $\varphi(10 \cdot 2^{-m-4})$ is less than $20 \cdot 2^{-m-5}$ and reject otherwise: Contradiction.

e) Continuing d), consider computable injective $\tilde{A} : [0;1] \ni x \mapsto \big(x, A(x)\big) \in [0;1]^2$ and $\tilde{B}(x) := \big(x, B(x) + 1\big) \in [0;2]^2$: The offset in $y$-coordinate dominates their pointwise distance in the 2D maximum norm over local reparametrization in $x$-coordiate. ■




Fig. 4. $d$-dimensional volume of convex sets is $2d$-Lipschitz in the worst-case, (unscaled) boundary area is $4d \cdot (d-1)$-Lipschitz and open a function.

*Proof of Theorem 17:*

c) $d$-dimensional volume of convex subsets of $[0;1]^d$ is $2d$-Lipschitz continuous, worst-case depicted in Figure 4: The unit hypercube has volume 1, shrinking it by $\varepsilon := 2^{-m}$ on each side yields volume $(1-2\varepsilon)^d \approx 1 - 2d\varepsilon$. Thus, for $C_m \subseteq \mathbb{D}_m^d$ approximating $W \in \mathcal{KC}([0;1]^d)$ up to error $2^{-m}$ in Hausdorff distance, the volume of the convex hull of $C_m$ approximates the volume of $W$ up to error $2d \cdot 2^{-m}$.

d) Slighly 'pulling' any extreme point of convex compact $W \subseteq [0;1]^d$ in/outwards, yields a proper sub/superset $W'$ which is again convex compact but with area of the boundary strictly larger/smaller than that of $W$, cmp. `math.stackexchange.com/questions/262568`: This shows that surface area measure is open a mapping; cmp. Figure 4. The latter also depicts a worst-case to

$4d(d-1)$-Lipschitz continuity of $\mathcal{KC}([0;1]^d) \ni W \mapsto$

$$\mapsto \underset{d-1}{\mathrm{Area}}(\partial W) = \liminf_{\delta \to 0} \frac{\mathrm{Vol}_d(W + \delta \cdot \overline{B}^d) - \mathrm{Vol}_d(W)}{\delta}$$

according to Minkowski-Steiner: The unit hypercube has surface area $2d$, shrinking it by $\varepsilon := 2^{-m}$ yields surface area $2d \cdot (1-2\varepsilon)^{d-1} \approx 2d - 4d \cdot (d-1)$. Thus, for $C_m \subseteq \mathbb{D}_m^d$ approximating $W \in \mathcal{KC}([0;1]^d)$ up to error $2^{-m}$ in Hausdorff distance, the surface area of the convex hull of $C_m$ approximates that of $W$ up to $4d(d-1) \cdot 2^{-m}$. ■




Fig. 5. Illustrating the proof of Remark 13g)